

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 980

CE 049 909

AUTHOR Charner, Ivan; Fraser, Bryna Shore
TITLE Youth and Work: What We Know, What We Don't Know, What We Need to Know.
INSTITUTION William T. Grant Foundation, Washington, DC.
Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship.
PUB DATE [88]
NOTE 121p.; A product of Youth and America's Future. For other papers in this series, see CE 049 906-912 and CE 049 914.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Educational Leadership, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 310, Washington, DC 20036-5541 (\$10.00).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Adolescents; *Education Work Relationship; *Employment Experience; Employment Level; *Employment Patterns; Employment Problems; High Schools; High School Students; Labor Market; *Part Time Employment; Public Policy; Research Needs; Student Attitudes; Student Behavior; Student Characteristics; *Student Participation; Trend Analysis; *Youth Employment
IDENTIFIERS Impact Studies

ABSTRACT

Participation in work activities by high school students has been increasing over the past 25 years to the point where today at least one-third of all high school students hold part-time jobs in any given week. Student participation in work varies by geographic region and type of community, with older, white, middle-class, male vocational students from the Northeast and north central region being the most likely to be employed. Although students may be found working in all industries, they tend to be concentrated in wholesale/retail trade, service, and agriculture/forestry/fishing. Male students tend to work more hours than female students, and white students work more than do minority students. Weekly income averages \$60-\$70, with males earning more on average than females. The effect of working on grades is unclear. There seems to be a curvilinear relationship between hours worked and grades, with 20 hours being the point where a negative effect emerges. Working appears to have little effect on educational plans but is positively associated with employment and income after high school completion, at least in the short range. Working during high school appears to promote desirable work habits. In general, relationships with parents and siblings are not affected by working. Findings regarding the effect of working on delinquent behavior are inconclusive and contradictory. There is a general need for improved and more comprehensive data related to youth and work; in addition, a common set of measures regarding working, reasons for working, the multiple dimensions of student work experiences, and the multiple attitudinal and behavioral outcomes of working is needed. (An annotated list of major data sources on youth and work is appended. Commentaries by Sue E. Berryman and Hayes Mizell are included.)

(MN)

ED 292980

Youth and Work:

**What We Know,
What We Don't Know,
What We Need To Know**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Grant Foundation

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by
**Ivan Charner
Bryna Shore Fraser**

National Institute for Work and Learning

CE049909

Youth and America's Future:

**The William T. Grant Foundation
Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship**



YOUTH AND AMERICA'S FUTURE: THE WILLIAM T. GRANT FOUNDATION COMMISSION ON WORK, FAMILY AND CITIZENSHIP

When William Thomas Grant established the Grant Foundation in 1936, he sought a better understanding of the ways in which individuals adapt to the vicissitudes of life. Touched in his professional life by the importance of good human relationships, Mr. Grant wished to "help children develop what is in them" so they would better "enjoy all the good things the world has to offer them."

Fifty years later, recognizing the special needs of older adolescents in our changing society, the Foundation's Trustees established **Youth and America's Future** with much the same purpose; its charge is to evaluate current knowledge, stimulate new ideas, increase communication among researchers, practitioners and policymakers, and, thus, to help our nation chart a better future for youth.

The Foundation's President, Robert J. Haggerty, M.D., has described the Commission's unique perspective:

"Against a rising chorus of legitimate concern about the many problems facing today's youth, the Foundation has initiated this Commission on Youth and America's Future to speak in a different voice. It will explore the strengths of America's young men and women, their families and the programs and community institutions that serve them. We adopt this approach not to diminish the importance of the problems that exist, but to learn the lessons of success. The Foundation is confident that this effort to look with renewed respect at youth, where it strides as well as where it stumbles, will help forge the links of understanding and mutual responsibility that make our democracy strong."

The publications in this series have been prepared to inform the Commission and to stimulate its thinking. While the Commission does not necessarily endorse the various findings presented, it does encourage their thoughtful consideration in the interests of American youth.

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Harold Howe II, Chairperson

Senior Lecturer, Graduate School of Education,
Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Byllie Y. Avery

Executive Director, National Black Women's
Health Project, Atlanta, GA

Mary Jo Bane

Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy
School of Government, Harvard University,
Cambridge, MA

Lewis H. Butler

President, California Tomorrow, San Francisco,
CA

Fletcher L. Byron

Retired Chairman and CEO, Koppers Company,
Carefree, AZ

Hillary Rodham Clinton

The Governor's Mansion; Partner, The Rose Law
Firm, Little Rock, AR

Barbara J. Easterling

Executive Vice President, Communications
Workers of America, Washington, D.C.

Josué M. González

President of the Board, Latino Institute; Director,
Bureau of Resource Development, Chicago
Public Schools, Chicago, IL

Albert H. Hastorf

Professor of Psychology, Stanford University
Stanford, CA

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C.

President (Emeritus), University of Notre Dame,
Notre Dame, IN

David W. Hornbeck

Maryland State Superintendent of Schools,
Baltimore, MD

Douglas X. Patiño

President, Marin Community Foundation,
Larkspur, CA

Michael V. Reagan

Director, Missouri Department of Social
Services, Jefferson City, MO

H W. Reicken

Professor (Emeritus) of Behavioral Sciences,
School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA

Kenneth S. Rolland

Managing Director, Chemical Bank, New York,
NY

Bernard C. Watson

President and CEO, William Penn Foundation,
Philadelphia, PA

William Julius Wilson

Chairman, Department of Sociology, University
of Chicago, Chicago, IL

Daniel Yankelovich

Chairman, Daniel Yankelovich Group, New
York, NY

Robert J. Haggerty, MD (ex-officio)

President, William T. Grant Foundation, New
York, NY

COMMISSION STAFF

Samuel Halperin
Study Director

Atelia Melaville
Research Associate

Arlette Taylor
Executive Assistant

YOUTH AND WORK: WHAT WE KNOW; WHAT WE DON'T KNOW; WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW

CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i-viii
I. <u>YOUTH AND WORK</u>	1
Background and Context	2
What This Paper Covers	5
The Structure of the Paper	6
II. <u>PATTERNS OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN WORK ACTIVITIES</u>	8
Age/Grade Level	8
Race	9
Gender	10
Socioeconomic Status	11
Residence	13
School Program	14
Summary	15
III. <u>REASONS FOR AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS PARTICIPATION IN WORK ACTIVITIES</u>	16
Summary	20
IV. <u>THE NATURE OF STUDENT WORK EXPERIENCES</u>	21
Types of Jobs	22
Length of Employment	26
Hours of Employment	28
Wages	30
Training on the Job	32
Social-Psychological Dimensions	33
Summary	34
V. <u>WORK ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES</u>	36
VI. <u>THE EFFECTS OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN WORK ACTIVITIES</u>	39
School Achievement, Activities, and Educational Plans	39
Post-High School Employment, Earnings, and Career Development	45
Youth Attitudes and Behaviors	47
Family and Peer Group Relationships	52
Summary	53

VII. <u>RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH</u>	55
General Needs	55
Proposed Research Agenda	56
Summary	64
VIII. <u>POLICY AND PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS: AN ACTION AGENDA</u>	65
Building on this Paper	65
Education and Information Programs	66
New Credits and Credentials for Working Youth	70
Dissemination of Information on Student Work Experience	70
Policy Recommendation	71
In Conclusion	72
REFERENCES	73
APPENDIX	
Major data Sources on Youth and Work	79
ABOUT THE AUTHORS	82
COMMENTARIES	
Sue E. Berryman	83
Hayes Mizell	97

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

YOUTH AND WORK:

WHAT WE KNOW; WHAT WE DON'T KNOW; WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW;

IVAN CHARNER
and
BRYNA SHORE FRASER

In America today, at least one-third of all high school students hold part-time jobs in any given week. In 1985, of the 14.5 million young people between the ages of 16 and 19, almost nine million (62%) were employed at least part of the year. The proportion of working teenagers has been growing steadily since 1964. A 16 year-old male attending school is five times more likely to work part-time today than in 1940, while a female the same age is 16 times more likely to be employed.

Today's headlines reflect a growing public debate on the value of this work experience for youth. Proponents of work experience point to the acquisition of employability skills, assumption of responsibilities, and integration into the world of work as positive effects of youth work. At the same time, however, critics are increasingly voicing concern regarding the negative effects of working on youth values, attitudes, and in-school and other behaviors.

Given the enormous economic and social implications of so many teenagers in the work force, information about the nature, patterns, and impact of teenage employment on educational performance, work attitudes, and family life becomes critical in determining future policies and programs related to student work experience.

This paper seeks to identify what we know and what we do not know about the impacts of teenagers working. By reviewing the available studies and literature, we examine: who works; why they work; where they work; what they do in their jobs; what their attitudes are about work and working; how their work roles and responsibilities relate to school, home, and community roles and responsibilities; and what the short-term and longer-range effects of working are on teenagers. Having examined these issues, we then offer a series of recommendations for further research, policy, and programmatic activities designed to enhance our understanding of the teenage work experience.

Far from being a passing fad, it appears that working while in school is here to stay for the majority of teenagers, across class, race, and gender boundaries. This trend is evident in the figures from the High School and Beyond survey (conducted by the U.S. Department of Education's Center on Education Statistics), which projected that 75 percent of 16-17 year old boys and 68 percent of girls were in the labor force in 1981.

While many have encouraged participation in the workplace for youth still in school, others have expressed concern that such work detracts from and distracts students from school-related activities like homework, class

participation, and extracurricular opportunities. Recently, several research studies have raised significant questions regarding the possible costs associated with teenage employment, including the potentially negative effects of work not only in relation to school but also on family relationships, attitudes toward work, and delinquent behavior. The findings of these studies, coupled with the demographics of a shrinking teenage labor force, have led to the current public concern regarding the possible negative aspects of work for youth.

In Section I, we set the parameters for this analysis of youth and work. For the purposes of this review and synthesis, we have chosen to focus on in-school youth at the high school level in naturally occurring jobs, since for most young people this is the stage at which they are first introduced to the world of work (90% of all high school students have worked by the time they are seniors in high school). The large majority of students find these jobs on their own, without the intervention of school or government. Unfortunately, these are the jobs we know the least about.

As a society we have assumed that the majority of young people successfully finding work on their own were no longer our responsibility or concern. They were perfectly capable of negotiating the transition from school to work on their own and eventually would be absorbed into the regular, full-time labor force. Recent studies indicate, however, that our neglect of this population may not have been entirely benign. If our youth are experiencing negative, possible harmful effects as a result of their working, it is critical to them, and to the future of our nation's economy, that we identify the reasons for these effects and work to ameliorate or reverse them. At the same time, it is important to determine the positive aspects of working so that we as a society may aim at enhancing the nature of the work experience. Whatever our personal preferences may be, it is clear that working teenagers are here to stay. At the very least, therefore, it is critical to determine what we do and do not know currently about the work experiences and the short-term and longer-term effects of jobs on our high school age youth, so that we may formulate appropriate, responsive, and timely research and action agendas.

In Section II, we present a relatively broad and comprehensive picture of the patterns of student participation in work activities for different demographic subgroups of the youth population. The major findings in this section include:

- o Participation in work activities by high school students has been increasing over the past twenty-five years. A clear picture of overall participation rates is hard to discern, however, because of the differing definitions of working used in the different studies.
- o Younger students and those in the earlier high school grades are less likely to work than older students and seniors in high school. Differences are on the magnitude of 15-20 percentage points between sophomores (15-16 year olds) and seniors (18-19 year olds).
- o White and Hispanic students have far higher rates of employment than Black students.
- o The differences in work participation between male and female students are generally small, favoring males. The two national samples show differences in the 4-6 percentage point range while the studies of more selected populations find larger differences between males and females.

- o The relationship between family SES and student work participation is unclear and seems to depend a great deal on how SES is measured. When multiple categories of SES are used, there tends to be a curvilinear relationship with middle class students participating in work at higher rates than lower and upper SES students. Where two-category measures are employed, high SES students are more likely to participate in work than low SES students. At the same time, a number of studies find little or no differences in participation rates for students from different family SES groups.
- o Student participation in work varies by region and type of community. Students from the North Central and Northeast regions have the highest rates of participation, while those from urban and suburban communities are somewhat more likely to work than those from rural communities.
- o Students in vocational programs are slightly more likely to work than are those in general or college preparatory programs.
- o Generally, older, white, male, middle SES, vocational students from urban and suburban communities in the North Central and Northeast regions have the highest rates of participation in work activities.

In Section III, reasons for and attitudes towards participation in work activities are analyzed. From existing studies, it is apparent that the majority of high school youth say they work in order to have money for items they want or need. Saving for future education and gaining work experience appear to be distant secondary reasons for working. Yet despite what may appear to be an emphasis on the materialistic value of work, today's youth still maintain a strong work ethic and an interest in working in order to gain rewards other than just monetary, including the opportunity to meet people, make new friends, be helpful to others, and learn new skills. (The question of whether the jobs youth hold provide them with the kinds of rewards they deem important is examined in "Section V. Work Roles and Responsibilities" and "Section VI. The Effects of Student Participation in Work Activities.")

In regard to why young people work, there is a significant gap in available information. No data have been collected on the psychosocial reasons that may influence a youth's decision to work, nor do we know very much about the ecological context surrounding entry into the labor market. A number of unknown variables may be in operation at this juncture, including the impact of mothers working, the influence of the media on youth perceptions of work, advertising's targeting on the youth consumer market, and the opportunities afforded by a job contrasted with those offered in school. Until specific, comparable data are collected on the input side of why youth work, our knowledge in this area will be limited to the most obvious outcome reasons.

In Section IV, we examine the nature of student work experiences. The major findings in this section include:

- o Students are found working in all industries but they tend to be concentrated in wholesale/retail trade, service, and agriculture/forestry/fishing.
- o Students work in most occupational groups but cluster in five occupations: operatives, service workers, laborers, sales workers, and farm laborers.

- o Differences in the types of jobs students hold are found due to gender, grade level, and school program.
- o Over one-third of eleventh and almost half of twelfth graders work at least half the school year.
- o About one-fourth of students work all three years while in high school and another one-quarter work for two of the three years.
- o The majority of students work less than twenty hours per week but a fairly large proportion (10%-30%) work over 30 hours per week.
- o Male students tend to work more hours than female students and Whites work more hours than minority students.
- o Hours worked per week is clearly related to the age/grade of the students.
- o Most high school students have low wages averaging around the prevailing minimum wage.
- o Males have higher hourly wages than females and minority students have lower wages than White students.
- o Weekly income, in the more recent studies, averages \$60-\$75 with males having higher weekly incomes than females.
- o In fast food jobs, the largest single source of training is on-the-job experience. This is, however, most often supplemented by training from managers, assistant managers, supervisors, films, and printed instructions.
- o The jobs students hold differ on a number of social-psychological dimensions including opportunities for learning, initiative, and social interaction.

In Section V, we examine the roles and responsibilities of youth in their jobs outside of school. While youth jobs are frequently characterized as being low skilled and low responsibility, few studies have examined the actual tasks and activities that young people do or are responsible for in their jobs. Measures such as the SEI and the content level of jobs suffer from assigning scores based on generalizations of adult occupations. And, the vast majority of studies have not asked about typical job duties or assignments. While we would not argue that youth jobs should be characterized as requiring high level skills or involving high level responsibilities, it does seem that others' generalizations are far too simplistic. More sophisticated and detailed analysis of youth work is needed before further conclusions can be drawn.

In Section VI the effects of student participation in work activities are examined. There are no easy or definitive answers on the effects of student participation in work activities. The major findings in this section include:

- o The effect of working on grades is unclear. There seems to be a curvilinear relationship between hours worked and grades, with 20 hours the "magical" cut off for when a negative effect emerges.

- o There is no effect of working on class rank, days tardy or absent, or number of extracurricular activities.
- o Students who worked more than 20 hours per week spent somewhat less time on homework but also less time watching television.
- o Working appears to have little effect on educational plans. Students who worked more than 20 hours per week, however, had lower educational aspirations.
- o Student work experience is positively associated with employment and income after completion of high school in the short range.
- o Working students are more likely to have lined up a job after graduation than those who do not work during high school.
- o Working during high school promotes desirable work habits and world of work knowledge and skills.
- o The findings in regard to the effect of working on delinquent behavior are inconclusive and contradictory.
- o Fast food employees report that parents and friends generally approve of their working.
- o Generally, relationships with parents and siblings are not affected by working, albeit they do spend less time with their families.
- o There is a critical need for further research on the attitudinal and behavioral effects of students working in the personal, school, home, community, and work domains.

Section VII puts forth a set of research recommendations relating to the need for a better and more comprehensive data base on youth and work. These recommendations include:

1. There is a general need for an improved and more comprehensive data base related to youth and work which examines: the detailed patterns of student participation in work experiences; the multiple dimensions of the nature of these work experiences; the roles and responsibilities of students as workers; and the effects of differential work experiences on different educational, family, social, and personal short and long-term outcomes. The data should be longitudinal, tracking students over a long period of time, starting before high school and continuing at least ten years after high school, and it should: a) examine the reasons why students work in general and in specific jobs, b) track patterns of work experience, c) explore the changing nature of work experiences over the early life-course, d) assess the long as well as short-term consequences of student work, and e) explore the relationships between work and other roles and responsibilities.

2. A common set of measures is needed on: working, the reasons for students working, the multiple dimensions of student work experiences, and the multiple attitudinal and behavioral outcomes of working. A set of common questions needs to be developed which can be used by future researchers. These questions should cover, at a minimum, the following:

- o work histories including: type of job, duration, hours worked, wages, length of employment, employer, and benefits;
- o multiple dimensions of work including: occupational self direction, position in the organizational structure, job pressures, and extrinsic risks and rewards;
- o reasons for working including: financial, experiential, learning, and social-psychological reasons; and
- o outcomes including: attitudinal and behavioral outcomes, both short and long-term.

3. Secondary analyses of existing data bases could add greatly to our information base. Secondary analyses could assess the detailed nature of student work experience, patterns of work experience, and effects of work experience. Of particular interest would be analyses of the effects of different work experiences on educational, personal, career, and other outcomes, both short and long-term. A number of specific secondary analyses are suggested.

4. A variation on the secondary analysis theme is to undertake meta-analyses to synthesize the research on youth and work. Meta-analysis is the quantitative cumulation of results across studies combining the results of independent studies for the purposes of integrating findings. Meta-analysis should be undertaken to synthesize the research on student work experiences, especially related to educational, career, and other personal outcomes.

5. Alternative data collection strategies could provide "richer" data on a number of critical issues. Small-scale studies, with intensive interviews, could be used to understand better the issues related to youth and work. Case studies are a second strategy for data collection that could provide detailed information on youth and work. Case studies employ a combination of observations, interviews, and document review to obtain a comprehensive and thorough picture of a program or group in its natural setting or own context.

6. Studies of youth and work issues in other countries can provide an important base for comparisons. Through comparative studies, differences in the processes related to youth and work and differences in the outcomes of these processes can be identified. The uncovering of parallels and contrasts between our own system and those of other countries will contribute to a greater understanding of youth and work.

In Section VIII a set of policy and program recommendations is proposed. This action agenda focuses on five critical areas: framing of key issues, education and information programs, new credits and credentials, dissemination of information, and policy legislation.

Our first recommendation is that others use this synthesis and review as a basis for framing and examining key issues related to youth and work. Groups of educators, employers, youth agency personnel, government officials, researchers, and experts on youth issues should be convened to review the information and recommend future directions for policies and practices in the area of youth and work.

One of the areas that is most in need of attention is the provision of timely and accurate information on the nature and effects of work experience

for all those affected. Many young people are inadequately informed about the responsibilities associated with a job, while many of their parents are unaware of the impact that working may have on their children's other activities and relationships. Teachers only rarely are informed of the jobs their students hold and what they do in those jobs. Few of the subjects they teach relate to the work experience and skills their students are gaining outside the classroom. Counselors frequently devote most of their time to the current and future educational needs of students, with little time and attention paid to working students and the reciprocal effects of school and work. Employers generally have little or no contact or communication with employees' teachers or counselors and know little about ways to initiate and maintain linkages with schools for individual employees. And, finally, community organizations with a large stake in the future educational and occupational well-being of their citizenry rarely serve as providers of communication or linkages among all the parties in the community affected by young people who work while in school. There is an important gap here that can be filled by implementing new information and education programs for each and all of these groups. Specific examples of education and information programs for parents, students, teachers, counselors, employers, and community groups are provided.

Recognizing that learning and development take place in settings other than just in school, the third recommendation responds to the need to create assessment measures for such learning to evaluate the academic achievements and skills that are gained and translate these measures into credit for non-school based work experience. Using models of credit for life experience granted at the postsecondary level, such as the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) and the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL) program, appropriate subject credits would be awarded.

It is essential that the knowledge gained from the research that has been done already and the research that has been proposed be made available, together with information on effective and creative programmatic approaches to student work experience, on as wide a basis as possible. The fourth piece of the action agenda is to establish a clearinghouse on youth employment issues as part of the already existing network of State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees (SOICCs).

Our policy recommendation is for new legislation. A Student Work Experience Experimentation and Demonstration Projects Act is proposed which would be modeled on the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (YEDPA), authorizing a range of research, evaluation, and demonstration activities aimed at increasing our understanding of work experience while in school in order to determine the most effective policies and programs to enhance the benefits and eliminate the disadvantages of student work experience. Projects funded under this Act would provide a wealth of information on what programs and strategies are effective for different subgroups of youth with differing needs.

In Conclusion

Given the large numbers of youth who are working and going to school simultaneously, it is apparent that youthwork is here to stay. What matters now is moving away from the status quo and actively ensuring that work experience during school is beneficial to young people in terms of their educational, occupational, and personal development.

By implementing the recommendations and research proposed in this paper, we will be taking some of the actions necessary as a society to ensure that today's youth will become tomorrow's responsible and productive workers, family members, and citizens.

I. YOUTH AND WORK

"Should Kids Work?"

"Desperately Seeking Teenagers"

"Learning in the Marketplace"

"Students' Jobs Cut School Activities"

"The Youth Market: A Valuable Resource"

These headlines from such diverse publications as The Wall Street Journal, Nation's Business, Fortune, The Christian Science Monitor, USA Today, and The Washington Post reflect a growing public debate on the value of work for youth. Because of their dwindling numbers and because of changes in the economy that have led to a significant growth of service sector jobs, young people are increasingly becoming a much sought-after commodity in the workplace. Concurrently, an increasing proportion of teenagers are working while going to school. Proponents of work experience for youth point to the acquisition of employability skills, assumption of responsibilities, and integration into the world of work as positive effects of youth work. At the same time, however, critics are increasingly voicing concern regarding the negative effects of working on youth values, attitudes, and in-school and other behaviors.

How does the research on youth and work inform the debate on the costs and benefits of work experience for youth? Recognizing that work is a critical factor in the lives of students, it is essential to understand better the value, roles, and functions of work for all American youth.

This paper seeks to identify what we know and what we do not know about the impacts of teenagers working. By reviewing the available studies and literature, we will examine: who works; why they work; where they work; what they do in their jobs; what their attitudes are about work and working; how their work roles and responsibilities relate to school, home, and community roles

and responsibilities; and what the short-term and longer-range effects of working are on teenagers. Having examined these issues, we will then offer a series of recommendations for further research, policy, and programmatic activities designed to enhance our understanding of the teenage work experience. Given the enormous economic and social implications of so many teenagers in the work force, information about the nature, patterns, and impact of teenage employment on educational performance, work attitudes, and family life becomes critical in determining future policies and programs related to student work experience.

Background and Context

In America today, at least one-third of all high school students hold part-time jobs in any given week. In 1985, of the 14.5 million young people between the ages of 16 and 19, almost nine million (62%) were employed at least part of the year. The proportion of working teenagers has been growing steadily since 1964. A 16 year old male attending school is five times more likely to work part-time today than in 1940, while a female the same age is 16 times more likely to be employed.

Changing demographics and labor market conditions explain some but not all of the growth. The demographics show that the population of youth has been declining since 1980, and this trend is expected to continue through the end of the century. In regard to labor market conditions, the decline of manufacturing and industrial sector jobs coupled with the rapid growth in service positions has increased the number of jobs available to youth. With more jobs available and fewer youth to fill them, this segment of the population has become and will continue to be in great demand by employers.

American society today lacks a clear, accepted conceptual model of youth transition from school to work--how youth are and should be related to the experiences of work and learning. Such a model did exist until the post-World War II period. This model held that formal schooling would be completed at the

time chosen by the individual (after a compulsory period), to be followed immediately by full-time participation in the labor force (for all males and some females). Schools were responsible mainly for providing the most basic literacy and mathematical learning rather than vocational preparation.

The skill requirements for most jobs were sufficiently low that employers could expect employees to learn on the job all that they would need to know. In addition, with communication and transportation systems being relatively expensive and primitive in this period, populations tended to be concentrated where the jobs were in an intense urban or factory-town environment. In short, the transition from school to work was most often swift and direct.

This world no longer exists, nor does the simple youth transition model common to that era. Unfortunately, since that time our society has acted as though the old model of transition behavior were still in operation. Youth employment policies have too often been conceptualized and implemented as corrective, stop-gap measures rather than in recognition of major systematic changes in the youth transition process.

These changes occurred under cover of the success of compulsory schooling, truancy laws, a growing secondary and postsecondary educational system, unionization of major industries, a growing suburban lifestyle, and, finally, a lengthy war. These socioeconomic events, coupled with the exponential growth of a highly technological, professionalized work culture, all served to remove youth from direct participation in the economic mainstream. Increasingly, the previously easy definition of the work force and the job market became more and more artificial when seen from a youth perspective.

Nearly 20 years ago, in 1968, the Princeton Manpower Symposium issued its now famous report, The Transition from School to Work, one of the first attempts to address this disjuncture. The report's objective was "to summarize and review the dimensions of the youth unemployment problem and to discuss the roles and

responsibilities of schools, private enterprise, trade unions, voluntary agencies, and various levels of government in development of better bridges between school and work for noncollege-bound youth"(1968:vii). One of the Symposium's main concerns was the lack of mechanisms to aid youth in making the transition from school to work.

In 1973, the Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee, chaired by Professor James Coleman, issued its landmark report, Youth: Transition to Adulthood. The Coleman report argued that American society had come to rely too heavily on the schools to prepare youth for adulthood and that the question that needed to be addressed was "what are appropriate environments in which youth can best grow into adults" (1973:XIII). One assumption put forth by the Coleman report and many of the panels and commissions that followed was that work experience would provide young people with expanded opportunities to become more responsible, contributing members of society. According to the National Panel on High School and Adolescent Education, as stated in its 1976 report, experience in the world of work would also address another concern of the times:

...only in the last 25 years has the majority of teenagers, through high school attendance, been increasingly separated from significant contact with older adults, other than parents and teachers. The successful achievement of a high school experience for nearly every one has been accompanied by a decoupling of the generations--for the young, delayed entry into the real adult world, prolongation of the institutional controls of childhood, delay in the early transmission of adult culture patterns....In prolonging youth's dependence the schools, inadvertently, have become social "aging vats" that have isolated adolescents and delayed their opportunity to learn adult roles, work habits, and skills.(1976:4-5)

In general, public perception over the last 20 years has mirrored that of the commissions and panels in its assumption that work experience for youth is positive. Far from being a passing fad, it appears that working while in school is here to stay for the majority of teenagers, across class, race, and gender boundaries. This trend is evident in the figures from the High School and Beyond survey (conducted by the U.S. Department of Education's Center on

Education Statistics), which projected that 75 percent of 16-17 year-old boys and 68 percent of girls were in the labor force in 1981.

While many have encouraged participation in the workplace for youth still in school, others have expressed concern that such work detracts from and distracts students from school-related activities like homework, class participation, and extracurricular opportunities. Recently, several research studies have raised significant questions regarding the possible costs associated with teenage employment, including the potentially negative effects of work not only in relation to school but also on family relationships, attitudes toward work, and delinquent behavior. The findings of these studies, coupled with the growing demand by employers for the shrinking teenage population, lead to the need for a thorough examination of what is known about the costs and benefits of youth work.

What This Paper Covers

For the purposes of this review and synthesis, we have chosen to focus on in-school youth at the high school level in naturally occurring jobs, since for most young people this is the stage at which they are first introduced to the world of work (90% of all high school students have worked by the time they are seniors in high school). The large majority of students find these jobs on their own, without the intervention of school or government. Unfortunately these are the jobs we know the least about.

Government and, to a lesser extent, school-sponsored employment programs have been studied in great detail over the last ten years in particular--witness the voluminous reports issued under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) as well as numerous studies of vocational, cooperative, and career education programs. These studies have provided researchers with a wealth of important findings regarding the effectiveness of these programs for different youth populations, and we do not wish to duplicate the work of others here (see

the Youth Knowledge Development Report series issued by the U.S. Department of Labor and later reports published by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation and Public/Private Ventures for detailed analyses of YEDPA programs).

As far as naturally occurring jobs are concerned, the research is far less extensive. As a society we have assumed that the majority of young people successfully finding work on their own were no longer our responsibility or concern. They were perfectly capable of negotiating the transition from school to work on their own and eventually would be absorbed into the regular, full-time labor force. Recent studies indicate, however, that our neglect of this population may not have been entirely benign. If our youth are experiencing negative, possible harmful effects as a result of their working, it is critical to them, and to the future of our nation's economy, that we identify the reasons for these effects and work to ameliorate or reverse them. At the same time, it is important to determine the positive aspects of working so that we as a society may aim at enhancing the nature of the work experience. Whatever our personal preferences may be, it is clear that working teenagers are here to stay. At the very least, therefore, it is critical to determine what we do and do not know currently about the work experiences and the short-term and longer-term effects of jobs on our high school age youth, so that we may formulate appropriate, responsive, and timely research and action agendas.

The Structure of the Paper

Three critical questions about student work experience are examined in this paper: what we know, what we don't know, and what we need to know. In Section II, the patterns of student participation in work activities are described. A broad brush picture is painted of the participation patterns for demographic subgroups of the youth population differentiated by: age, race, gender, socioeconomic status, place of residence, and school program. Section III provides an analysis of the reasons for and attitudes toward participation

in work activities. This section examines the monetary, social, and skill acquisition reasons for students' working.

In the fourth section, the nature of student work experience is assessed. Detailed in this section are a number of dimensions of youth work including: types of jobs, occupations, and industries; length of student employment; hours of employment; wages and income; training on the job; and social-psychological dimensions. The fifth section examines the work roles and responsibilities of students in their jobs. Section VI explores the effects of student participation in work activities on: school achievement, activities, and educational plans; post-high school employment, wages, and career development; youth attitudes and behaviors in the workplace and community; and family and peer relationships.

In Section VII recommendations for research are proposed. The general need for better and more comprehensive information is detailed, followed by a specific agenda for further research. The final section explores policies and practices for understanding and enhancing the work and academic experiences of working youth. An action agenda is proposed which focuses on effective linkages between work, school, home, and the community.

A brief description of each of the major data sources which provide information on the issues discussed in this paper is provided in Appendix A. The measures of employment used in these studies and references for further description also are provided.

II. PATTERNS OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN WORK ACTIVITIES

In the last twenty-five years there has been a significant growth in the proportion of youth who work part-time while in high school. Current estimates of the percent of high school students working range from 30 percent to over 70 percent. The wide range is a function of two factors: the definition of employment and the age/grade levels of the students in the studies. When employment is equated with having held a job sometime during high school, the proportion of "employed students" reaches 70-80 percent (D'Amico, 1984). If the question asks "were you employed last week" or "do you presently have a paying job," the proportions decrease to the 50% range (Lewin-Epstein, 1981; Mortimer and Finch, 1986). The proportions decline even further if the criterion for employment is "having a job for over half the school year" (D'Amico, 1984). With regard to the second factor - age/grade levels - the research findings are far more consistent. Younger students and those in their earlier high school years are less likely to hold a job (however defined) than are older students in higher grades.

An understanding of the patterns of student participation in work activities is definitely needed. It is important to know, for example, if female students are as likely to work as male students, or if black students are disproportionately represented in the "not employed" group. Because information has not been systematically collected nor analyzed to allow for comparisons between subgroups of youth, there are many gaps in our knowledge base. There is, however, sufficient information to present a relatively broad and comprehensive picture of the patterns of student participation in work activities for different demographic subgroups of the youth population.

Age/Grade Level

As stated earlier, age is clearly related to student participation in work activities, whether measured in terms of chronological age or years in school.

Lewin-Epstein (1981) in his analysis of the High School and Beyond (HSB) study of high school sophomores and seniors found that 40% of 15 year-olds were employed compared to 67% for 18-19 year-olds. Michael and Tuma (1983) found a consistent 10 percentage point increase in rates of employment for students 15 years old (34%), 16 years old (44%), and 17 years old (54%). D'Amico (1984) in his analysis of the National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Market Experience of Youth (DOL-NLS) found higher proportions of twelfth graders than eleventh graders working "at least one week" and working "more than half a year." Greenberger and Steinberg (1986) in their study of Orange County (CA) students (OCS) found that 32% of the tenth graders in their sample were working compared with 46% of the eleventh graders. It seems safe to conclude, from these disparate data sources, that participation in employment is related to age and/or grade level for high school students.

Race

Race, like age, is also related to participation in work for high school students. In every study which compared levels of participation, white students were more likely to be employed than minority students. One of the earliest studies examining high school student work experience was the National Longitudinal Surveys (NLS) of young men and young women. Initial data were collected in 1966 (on men) and in 1968 (on women). Stevenson (1978), in his analysis of these data, found small differences in the work patterns of black and white students. For the male students in his sample, 48% of the whites and 45% of the blacks were employed. When female students were compared, the findings showed 31% of White and 24% of black students employed. For the sophomores in his study, Lewin-Epstein (1981) found participation rates of 29%, 35%, and 44% for blacks, Hispanics, and whites, respectively. The differences between high school seniors were just as pronounced, with 49% of blacks, 60% of Hispanics, and 65% of whites employed. Analyses of the DOL-NLS data show even

greater differences (Lewis et al., 1983; D'Amico, 1984). Participation rates for blacks, Hispanics, and whites, for this sample, were 50%, 59%, and 70% respectively. Gottfredson (1985) in her School Action Effectiveness Study of 9th-12th graders from 69 schools found considerably higher rates of working for whites (64%) than blacks (34%). Greenberger and Steinberg (1986) found similar distributions for their sample. Forty-one percent of the white students were employed compared with 42% of Hispanic and only 19% of black students.

Again, our conclusion is that race is a factor in explaining student participation in work activities. Black students consistently have lower participation rates than their hispanic and white counterparts, while white students show the highest proportions of employment, regardless of age, grade, or gender.

Gender

The data on gender differences in participation, while not as clear-cut, show differences between males and females. Stevenson (1978), in his analysis of the NLS, found that for 16-19 year old in-school youth, females were much less likely to be employed than were males. Specifically, 48% of white males were employed compared to 31% of white females. The percentages for blacks were 45% and 24% for males and females, respectively. The HSB study (Lewin-Epstein, 1981) found 44% of male sophomores and 66% of male seniors employed, compared to 40% and 61% for female sophomores and seniors, respectively. The DOL-NLS data showed a similar pattern, with 70% of the males and 64% of the females employed while in high school (Lewis et al., 1983; D'Amico, 1984). The largest differences in employment patterns between high school males and females were found by Gottfredson (1985). The proportion of female students in her sample who had a job was 33% compared to 45% for the male students. The OCS sample (Greenberger and Steinberg, 1986) provided similar results with 46% of males and 36% of females employed in their first job.

For any cohort in the general population, a higher proportion of men than women work. It is, therefore, not surprising to find that this pattern holds for high school students. What may be surprising is the closeness of the proportions, except for the Gottfredson sample. The differences of four percent and six percent for the HSB and DOL-NLS samples suggest greater similarity in patterns of participation for male and female students than may have been expected based on Census, Bureau of Labor Statistics, or other data on the general population.

Socioeconomic Status

The relationship of family socioeconomic status (SES) to student employment is not as clear. Much of the lack of clarity may be due to the different measures of family SES that were used in the different studies. Lewin-Epstein (1981), using family income as his measure of family SES, found a curvilinear relation to employment. Participation rates for sophomores increased for family income levels through \$25,000 and then decreased. The pattern for seniors was similar, with the change in direction occurring at the \$38,000 level. The data suggest that middle-income youth are more likely to participate in work activities than are lower- and upper-income youth.

In the DOL-NLS studies (Lewis et al., 1983), family SES was a composite measure of mother's education, father's education, father's occupational prestige, and availability of reading materials. For male high school students there was a curvilinear relationship between family SES and employment. Sixty percent of low SES males were employed compared with 73% of middle and 70% of high SES males. For female students, the rate of participation increased as family SES increased.

Schill et al. (1985), in their study of high school students from the State of Washington (SWS), assessed the relation between work and SES using four different measures of SES. When they used the Duncan Socioeconomic Index

(based on an estimate of education requirements, earnings, and prestige of occupations), they found differences in employment favoring students from high Socioeconomic Index (SEI) families over those from lower SEI families. With parental education as the proxy for SES, no differences were uncovered. More specifically, the mother's mean SEI was 43.6 for employed students compared to 39.4 for students not employed. Father's mean SEI was 44.5 and 41.0 for employed and not employed students, respectively. In terms of education, there were no differences between employed and not employed students on both mother's and father's educational attainments.

Mortimer and Finch (1986), in their secondary analysis of the Youth in Transition (YIT) longitudinal study of 10th grade (1966) male students, found no relationship between propensity to work while in high school and family SES measured by an index of father's occupation and education and mother's education. Meyer and Wise (1982) in their analyses of the National Longitudinal Study of the Class of 1972 (NLS-72) found that employment was not related to overall SES. When they looked at parental income and education separately, they did find a positive relation for the former but no relation for the latter with participation in work activities for high school seniors. Finally, Greenberger and Steinberg (1986) found little difference in the proportion of students from different classes who worked. Using father's occupation as the measure of social class, the researchers found that 41% of students from professional families worked compared with 41% and 39% for students from white collar/management and blue collar families, respectively.

The picture that emerges with regard to the relationship between family SES and student participation in work is unclear. There appear to be a few differences in participation rates across social class groups in most of the studies. Where differences do emerge, they tend to be curvilinear with the highest rates of participation in work found for students in the middle SES.

Residence

Only a few of the studies that have examined the demographic differences (or similarities) between high school students who work and those who do not work focus on place of residence as a factor. In their analyses of the DOL-NLS, Lewis et al. (1983) uncovered differences in work patterns by geographical region and urbanicity. With regard to geographical region, they found higher proportions of both male and female students working if they were from the North Central region of the country (78% and 70% for males and females, respectively). For males, the region with the next highest percent was the West (74% employed), followed by the Northeast (66%), and then the South (62%). For the females in the sample, the region with the second highest proportion of student workers was the Northeast (67%), followed by the West (64%) and South (58%). The urban/rural differences were not as dramatic, with approximately 68% of urban students working compared with about 62% for students from rural areas.

In the HSB data set (Lewin-Epstein, 1981), work patterns of students varied considerably from region to region. For the sophomores in the sample, the proportion of those employed was largest for the Northeast (49%) and West North Central (49%) and lowest for the East South Central (32%). The other regions had participation rates as follows: East North Central (44%), Mountain (44%), and Pacific (44%), West South Central (40%), Mid Atlantic (39%), South Atlantic (38%). For the seniors the differences were not as pronounced, but the ordering was basically the same: West North Central (69%), East North Central (67%), Northeast (67%), Mountain (64%), Pacific (63%), Mid Atlantic (61%), South Atlantic (61%), West South Central (61%), and East South Central (56%). With regard to type of community, suburban students were more likely to work (43% for sophomores and 66% for seniors) than urban (37% and 61%) or rural (42% and 60%) students.

Based on the information from these two national data bases, it seems safe to conclude that participation does vary according to region and type of community. Higher rates of student participation in work are found in the North Central and Northeast regions, with lowest rates generally found among students from the Southern regions. Also, urban and suburban students generally participate in work at slightly higher rates than rural youth.

School Program

Program of study in high school is also believed to be related to student work participation. One would assume that students in vocational programs would be more likely to work because of such programs' emphasis on preparing students to work. Surprisingly, the differences among programs is not as great as would be expected. While we do find students in vocational programs somewhat more likely to participate in work than academic or general program students, the differences in proportions are not that large. In fact, the difference among the three education programs is less than ten percentage points. More specifically, HSB showed 44% of sophomores and 69% of seniors in vocational programs were employed. For general programs the corresponding proportions were 43% and 62%, and for those in college preparatory they were 41% and 61% (Lewin-Epstein, 1981). The DOL-NLS study reported similar trends but at generally higher levels. Specifically, 72% of the students in vocational programs were employed, compared to 65% for those in general programs and 68% for those in college preparatory (Lewis et al., 1983).

School program, then, seems to have only a small effect on students' propensity to work while in school. Students in vocational programs are only slightly more likely to work than are their counterparts in general or college preparatory programs.

Summary

While definitions of work differ across studies, a general pattern of student participation in work activities is apparent. That pattern can be summarized as follows:

- o Participation in work activities by high school students has been increasing over the past twenty-five years. A clear picture of overall participation rates is hard to discern, however, because of the differing definitions of working used in the different studies.
- o Younger students and those in the earlier high school grades are less likely to work than older students and seniors in high school. Differences are on the magnitude of 15-20 percentage points between sophomores (15-16 year olds) and seniors (18-19 year olds).
- o White and Hispanic students have far higher rates of employment than black students.
- o The differences in work participation between male and female students are generally small, favoring males. The two national samples show differences in the 4-6 percentage point range while the studies of more selected populations find larger differences between males and females.
- o The relationship between family SES and student work participation is unclear and seems to depend a great deal on how SES is measured. When multiple categories of SES are used, there tends to be a curvilinear relationship with middle class students participating in work at higher rates than lower and upper SES students. Where two-category measures are employed, high SES students are more likely to participate in work than low SES students. At the same time, a number of studies find little or no differences in participation rates for students from different family SES groups.
- o Student participation in work varies by region and type of community. Students from the North Central and Northeast regions have the highest rates of participation, while those from urban and suburban communities are somewhat more likely to work than those from rural communities.
- o Students in vocational programs are slightly more likely to work than are those in general or college preparatory programs.
- o Generally, older, white, male, middle SES, vocational students from urban and suburban communities in the North Central and Northeast regions have the highest rates of participation in work activities.

III. REASONS FOR AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS PARTICIPATION IN WORK ACTIVITIES

Having examined the general pattern of student participation in work activities, we turn next to the question of why these youth choose to work and how they feel about work in general.

In reviewing the available studies and literature on reasons for working, two factors quickly become evident: first, very few studies have looked at this question and, second, those that have attempted to determine why youth work have focused mainly on outcome reasons (for example, to have money for things they want or to save for their future education). None of the studies reviewed addressed the input side of why youth work, the "social-ecological" context that may result in a young person seeking a job. This broader context would include such factors as: boredom in school; loneliness or boredom at home after school hours; or feeling safer at work than on the street.

In addition, no one has looked at the psychological or sociological reasons for young people choosing to work, such as the possibility that youth who may not be achieving in other areas, chiefly school, may in fact wish to work as a means of enhancing their self-esteem by providing themselves with an environment in which they feel they perform capably. Other young people may feel that the workplace provides them with more independence and responsibility than they are afforded at home or in school. Unfortunately, the literature contains very little information relating to these input reasons for young people working.

Given the gaps that exist in the information on why students work, what do we know about the reasons they give for working? A number of studies have asked young workers to choose from several possible options in answer to the question of why they work.

In its 1981 survey of a small sample of high school seniors, the Greater Portland (OR) Work-Education Council in its Work Attitudes Survey (WAS) found

that the chief reason for having a job was to "have money for other things" (rated as very important by 68% of the respondents), followed closely by to "save for future education" (60%). A large majority indicated that the following were not important reasons for their having a job: "because friends work at my job" (87% said this was not an important reason) and "to help support my family" (74%). Parents wanting them to work was also not judged important by a majority of the youth.

Somewhat comparable findings were reported by Charner and Fraser (1984). In answer to the question "how important are these reasons for your having your fast food job," the vast majority of the 14-17 year old fast food employees indicated that having money for other things was very important (81%), followed by supporting themselves (56%), and having the experience of working (52%). Forty-five percent said that their parents wanting them to work and saving for their future education were very important reasons for them working. As in the Portland study, working to help support their family or to be with their friends were cited as very important by only ten and nine percent, respectively.

In their study of employed Orange County (CA) high school students, Greenberger and Steinberg (1986) also found that the students worked chiefly to make money. When asked to indicate their chief reason for being employed, 38% of the respondents endorsed the statement "in order to earn money for things I really needed," while 36% indicated: "I didn't really have to work, but I wanted to have money for extras." Greenberger and Steinberg interpret these responses to mean that, concomitant with inflation in the costs of adolescent "staples" (such as clothes, records, and movies), there has been an increase in materialism among youth, "an inflated interest in the acquisition of luxury goods" (1986: 28).

Similar concerns are expressed by Bachman (1983) who worries that "premature affluence" may eventually have a negative impact on youth as they mature and are

compelled to spend a large proportion of their income on life's necessities (food and rent) rather than on luxuries.

Yet, if indeed young people today are more interested in acquiring things than were their predecessors (and there are few data to substantiate or refute such a claim), findings from the Monitoring the Future (MTF) study, the Fast Food Jobs (FFJ) study, and the Portland (OR) Work Attitudes Survey (WAS) indicate that the work ethic and positive attitudes toward working are very strong among youth generally and among working youth in particular.

When asked "if you were to get enough money to live as comfortably as you'd like for the rest of your life, would you want to work," 78% of the MTF respondents and 80% of the 14-17 year old fast food employees indicated they would want to work. Seventy percent of the respondents from the MTF and FFJ studies and 87% of the youth in the WAS study disagreed with the statement "work is nothing more than making a living." Over 90% of the MTF and FFJ respondents and 89% of the WAS youth agreed that "I want to do my best in my job, even if this sometimes means working overtime."

Cole, in her interviews with working youth, reported that almost all of the young people liked working. "Even when they disliked their jobs, they liked the power and independence they got from earning their own money. In our society, attaining that power and independence is part of what it means to be achieving adulthood" (1980:17). Cole's observation builds on Temme's identification of seven types of returns of work - benefits and rewards that can be accrued as a result of performing a work routine. While Temme focused on adult workers, his classifications have equal significance in seeking to determine why young people work.

According to Temme (1975), the seven types of returns that can be used to differentiate various types of work are: earnings - the rate at which a person is paid for time spent working, including direct pay and fringe benefits;

prestige - the social esteem accorded to an incumbent of a work position by virtue of holding the position; power - the influence over the behavior of other persons which derives from holding a work position; autonomy - the freedom to control how one conducts one's own work; association - the types and quality of interpersonal relationships that can be formed as a result of holding a work position; social benefits - the opportunity to contribute to the benefit of others or the public good; and personal growth - the opportunity to improve one's proficiencies or develop new capacities.

All of these returns can function as satisfactions derived from work, either as incentives or motivations for individuals to perform the work. Whether a particular return acts as a reward in a particular setting will depend on the worker. However, it is possible to generalize across particular settings and workers and refer to average levels of each return for a given work activity.

Paralleling Temme's seven types of rewards, the MTF study asked respondents to indicate how important different job rewards were to them. In regard to earnings, 90% said it was very or pretty important to have a job providing a chance to earn a great deal of money. Sixty-three percent rated a job with high status and prestige as pretty or very important, while 75% indicated that having a job "most people look up to and respect" was important.

In regard to power and autonomy, 73% rated the chance to participate in decision making as important, while 66% thought it important to have a job that left them mostly free of supervision by others. A job that permitted contact with a lot of people and that offered the opportunity to make friends was considered important by 89% and 88%, respectively.

Relating to social benefit, 84% thought it important to have a job that offered the opportunity to be directly helpful to others, while 81% said it was important to have a job that was worthwhile to society.

Finally, in regard to personal growth, 88% of the MTF respondents indicated that having a job where they could learn new things and new skills was important. In addition, 71% thought it important to have a job that offered them the chance to be creative.

Summary

From existing studies, it is apparent that the majority of high school youth say they work in order to have money for items they want or need. Saving for future education and gaining work experience appear to be distant secondary reasons for working. Yet despite what may appear to be an emphasis on the materialistic value of work, today's youth still maintain a strong work ethic and an interest in working in order to gain rewards other than just monetary, including the opportunity to meet people, make new friends, be helpful to others, and learn new skills. (The question of whether the jobs youth hold provide them with the kinds of rewards they deem important is examined in "Section V. Work Roles and Responsibilities" and "Section VI. The Effects of Student Participation in Work Activities.")

In regard to why young people work, there is a significant gap in available information. No data have been collected on the psychosocial reasons that may influence a youth's decision to work, nor do we know very much about the ecological context surrounding entry into the labor market. A number of unknown variables may be in operation at this juncture, including the impact of mothers working, the influence of the media on youth perceptions of work, advertising's targeting on the youth consumer market, and the opportunities afforded by a job contrasted with those offered in school. Until specific, comparable data are collected on the input side of why youth work, our knowledge in this area will be limited to the most obvious outcome reasons.

IV. THE NATURE OF STUDENT WORK EXPERIENCES

In the literature on youth and work, student work experience has been characterized as predominately part-time, low-level, sex stereotyped, low pay, low skilled, low commitment, non-career, casual, and "dead-end" (Hamilton and Crouter, 1980; Lewin-Epstein, 1981; Lewis et al., 1983; Greenberger and Steinberg, 1986). At the same time it is important to note that the vast majority of research on student participation in work activities fails to differentiate among types of work and aspects of jobs (Greenberger, Steinberg, and Ruggiero, 1982).

The literature on adult work experience has recognized the multidimensionality of work environments (Temme, 1975; Kohn and Schooler, 1978, 1982); and the differential outcomes of working on different types of jobs (Kohn and Schooler, 1978, 1982; Kohn, 1980). Unfortunately, the research on youth work experience is either unidimensional, focusing on work versus non-work, or limited to a smaller number of dimensions. The importance of recognizing the multidimensionality of youth work is demonstrated by the research in the adult arena. Kohn and Schooler and their colleagues at the National Institute on Mental Health have examined the effects of fourteen job conditions on personality, psychological functioning, intellectual flexibility, and other factors. The results of their research suggest a complex set of reciprocal relationships between job conditions and personality. One obvious recommendation of their work is the need for multi-indicator measures of the following job conditions: occupational self-direction, position in the organizational structure, job pressures, and extrinsic risks and rewards.

While there is an obvious need for research that explores the multidimensions of youth work, it is possible to put together a mosaic of the nature of student work experiences. The mosaic, by necessity, focuses on types of jobs, length of employment, hours, wages, and training. Where possible, the social-

psychological dimensions of student work also will be examined.

Types of Jobs

High school students can be found working in all industries and in most occupational groups. Despite the differences across studies in how industries and occupations are classified, there is a tendency for students to be concentrated in a small number of industries and occupations.

Analysis of the early National Longitudinal Surveys (Stevenson, 1978) shows that students' last jobs in high school are concentrated in three industries. Differences, however, are found as a function of gender and race. Fully 48% of White male high school students worked in wholesale/retail trades, 17% were in services and recreation, and 15% in agriculture, forestry, and fishing industries. For black male students the same three industries had the highest proportions of students. Specifically, 37% were in wholesale/retail trades, 29% in services and recreation, and 10% in agriculture, forestry, and fishing. For the females in the NLS sample, only two industries account for the vast majority of employment in high school. For white female students, 54% were in wholesale/retail trade and 32% in services and recreation. The distribution for black females in these two industries is reversed. Over twice as many black females were in services and recreation (55%) than wholesale/retail trade (25%).

In terms of the last occupations these students held while in high school, the NLS data show the following. Almost 80% of white males worked in five occupations: operators (20%), service workers (16%), laborers (16%), sales workers (14%), and farm laborers (13%). For black males, only two occupational groups had proportions of greater than ten percent. Over one-quarter (27%) of black males were service workers, and almost one in five were operatives. Over 90% of white female students worked in four occupational groups. Thirty-two percent worked as clerical workers, 29% as service workers, 22% as sales workers,

and 10% as private household workers. Black females, on the other hand, were concentrated in three occupational groups: clerical workers (31%), service workers (27%), and private household workers (20%).

In their analysis of the more recent National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Market Experience of Youth, Lewis et al. (1983) assessed the job families, occupations, job content, and industry of high school students' jobs. With regard to job families, male students were most likely to work in three job families. The nonspecialized tools family, which includes skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled jobs, accounts for 31% of the male students. The authors point out, however, that "most students are working at the lower end of the skill range within the job family" (Lewis et al., 1983:56). Twenty-one percent of the males in the DOL-NLS worked in the personal services family which includes fast food workers, waiters/waitresses, housekeepers, ushers, and janitors. An additional 10% worked in the vehicle operation family of jobs. The jobs that the female students held were even more concentrated. Forty-two percent worked in the personal services job family and 31% worked in the clerical job family.

More than half of the students in the DOL-NLS study held jobs in wholesale/retail trade (52% for males and for females). An additional 11% of male students are employed in manufacturing, 8% in agriculture, 6% in professional service, and 6% in business service. For female high school students, the industries in addition to wholesale/retail trade with fairly large proportions were professional service (13%) and personal service (13%). It is interesting to note that there is little difference in industry affiliation for the jobs students held in the late 1960's and those held by students ten years later.

When the occupations of the DOL-NLS high school students were examined, we found that most students fell into a small number of occupational groups. For male students, 30% were in service occupations, 22% were laborers, and 15% were

operatives. - The female students were most often in service (39%) and clerical (31%) occupations with smaller proportions in household service (10%) and sales (9%) jobs.

A third data set which provides information on the types of jobs students hold is HSB. Lewin-Epstein (1981) in his analysis of these data points out that the job categories used in his study do not correspond to more common classifications and that there is a large "other" category (20%). Further, there is no industrial or job family breakdown provided for this sample. The findings do suggest some interesting differences in the types of jobs different groups of students held.

First, for high school sophomores babysitting (26%) and "other" (23%) were the two largest categories of types of jobs. An additional 12% worked in food service jobs. Odd jobs (8%), manual labor (7%), store clerk (7%), and farm work (7%) together accounted for an additional 29%. The pattern for the seniors in the study was very different. Twenty-two percent worked as store clerks, 20% in "other jobs," 17% in food service, and 10% in clerical work. It also is interesting to note that for seniors the proportion reporting babysitting as their job declined to 5% and those doing odd jobs to 2%.

Not surprisingly, there were differences between male and female students in each cohort. During the sophomore year, the vast majority of females were found in the babysitting (50%) or "other" (15%) job categories. Their male counterparts were most likely to work in "other" (30%), odd jobs (14%), manual labor (13%), farm work (11%), and food service (10%). In the senior cohort, female students were most likely to work as store clerks (25%), in food service (22%), clerical work (18%), and "other" jobs (15%). Senior males worked most often in "other" jobs (26%), as sales clerks (18%), manual laborers (14%), in food service (12%), and in skilled trades (11%).

A number of differences were found in the types of jobs held by students from different school programs. These differences were more pronounced for the senior than sophomore cohort. Among sophomores, those in college preparatory programs were more likely to babysit (32%) than were students in general (24%) or vocational (21%) programs. College preparatory students also were less likely to have farm jobs (4%) than general (7%) and vocational (10%) students. For seniors it was the vocational students that looked most different. They were more likely to hold clerical and skilled trade jobs and less likely to be store clerks or work at food service jobs.

As Lewin-Epstein (1981) suggests, racial/ethnic, SES, and type of community differences were not as pronounced as grade level, gender, and school program differences. With regard to racial/ethnic differences for the sophomore cohort, blacks were more likely than others to hold odd jobs, Hispanics more likely to have food service jobs and work as store clerks, and whites more likely to babysit. For seniors the most profound differences were found for store clerks (favoring whites over blacks and Hispanics) and clerical work (favoring blacks). The racial/ethnic differences were clearly less for seniors than sophomores.

SES differences for sophomores were very small. In fact, only for babysitting was a difference of more than three percentage points found. Middle SES students were more likely to hold this job than lower or upper SES students. For seniors the only real differences were for store clerks (favoring high SES students) and clerical work (favoring lower SES students).

With regard to type of community, the major differences related to farm work. Not surprisingly, rural students from both cohorts were more likely than urban and suburban students to do farm work. In addition, slightly fewer rural seniors did clerical work or were store clerks while suburban sophomores were more likely to babysit.

In summary, a number of conclusions can be drawn about the types of jobs held by high school students. First, student jobs are concentrated in three industries: wholesale/retail trade; service and recreation; and agriculture, forestry, and fishing. There are some differences between males and females and between black and white students. Second, if job families are used instead of industry, students are concentrated in the nonspecialized tools family, personal services, and clerical jobs. Differences are found between male and female students. Third, in terms of specific occupations, students tend to cluster in five occupations: operatives, service workers, laborers, sales workers, and farm laborers. Fourth, there are clear differences in the types of jobs based on grade level, gender, and school program. Smaller differences are found due to race, SES, and type of community. Finally, and perhaps most important, is the lack of compatability across studies with regard to the type of job held by high school students. Industrial or job family categories, occupational groups, and job categories all differ across studies. A common classification scheme is obviously needed.

Length of Employment

Only a few studies of student work experience have examined length of employment, either in terms of specific jobs or employment during school years (employed in grade 10, 11, and/or 12). Mortimer and Finch (1986), in their analysis of the YIT data, assessed the distribution of work time for male high school students. They found that 18% of the students who were employed in tenth grade were also employed (not necessarily in the same job) in the eleventh and twelfth grades. An additional 18% were employed only during the eleventh and twelfth grades. In the sample, one-quarter were never employed, 6% employed only in grade ten, 7% only in grade 11, and 16% only in grade 12. From these data one can estimate the duration of employment for these male high school students: 25% never worked; 29% worked for one year during high school; 30% worked for two

years; and 18% worked each year for the three years they were in high school.

D'Amico (1984), in his analysis of the DOL-NLS, examined the extent of employment of high school students through an analysis of the proportions employed half the school year or more. For both males and females the proportion who worked half the school year or more increased from tenth grade through twelfth grade. In the tenth grade, 9% of females and 13% of males worked half the school year or more. By grade 11, the proportions increased to 33% for females and 39% for males. And, in grade 12, fully 47% of the females and half of the males were employed for half the school year or more. Within each grade White students were more likely than their Black peers to be employed at least half the school year. The differences between these two groups of students were 4 percentage points (13% vs. 9%) in grade 10, 20 percentage points (45% vs. 25%) by grade 11, and 19 percentage points (57% vs. 38%) in grade 12.

Employing a similar strategy to that used by Mortimer and Finch (1986) to assess patterns of high school employment, D'Amico (1983) found that 27% of the students who were employed in grade 10 were also employed in grades 11 and 12. An additional 19% were employed during both grades 11 and 12. Estimation of the duration of employment for these high school students suggests that 25% were never employed, 24% were employed for only one year during high school, 24% worked for two years, and 27% worked each year for the three years they were in high school.

A third study which looked at length of employment for high school students was the National Study of Employment in the Fast Food Industry (FFJ). In their analysis of the FFJ data, Charner and Fraser (1984) found the mean length of employment in fast food jobs to be clearly related to age. Employees 14-15 years old had a mean length of employment of 8.7 months compared to 10.4 months for 16-17 years olds. Older workers who had the opportunity to work longer had in fact done so.

In terms of length of employment, what do the data tell us? First, the pattern of employment during high school is fairly constant. About one-quarter of all students have never worked, with a similar proportion working one year, two years, and all three years during high school. Second, while only a small proportion of students in the tenth grade worked at least half the school year, over one-third of eleventh graders and almost half of twelfth graders worked half the school year or more. Third, within the fast food industry, one of the largest employers of youth, high school aged youth were employed at their fast food jobs for almost one year.

Hours of Employment

While few studies have examined the length of employment for high school students, a fairly large number have explored hours worked. Again, however, there is little consistency across studies on how hours of work is measured. For the NLS study, which measured "number of hours worked last week," Stevenson (1978) found that male high school students worked an average of 18.5 hours per week while females worked an average of 14 hours per week.

Analysis of the NLS-72 data (Fetters, 1976), on the "average number of hours per week over the school year worked in a paid or unpaid job," showed that: 24% of the students didn't work; 24% worked an average of 10 hours or less; 24% worked an average of 11-20 hours; 18% worked an average of 21-30 hours; and 11% worked an average of more than 30 hours per week. Lewin-Epstein's analysis of the HSB data (1981) on the "hours worked last week" found the mean hours worked to be 12.6 for sophomores and 19.4 for seniors. Almost one-third of the sophomores and less than 10% of the seniors worked less than five hours per week. Almost 80% of the sophomores and almost 60% of the seniors worked 22 hours or less per week. Male students worked more hours than females, with senior males averaging 21.1 hours per week compared to 17.8 hours for senior females. Hispanic students in the sample had the highest mean hours of work (15.2 hours),

followed by blacks (12.9 hours), and whites (12.4 hours). Also, students in vocational programs worked longer hours on the average (14 hours) than those in general (13.2 hours) or college preparatory (11 hours) programs.

Lewis et al. (1983) in their analysis of the DOL-NLS study found that the students in the sample had a mean of 20 hours worked per week. The mean for male students was slightly higher than for females, 21.1 hours compared to 18.7 hours. Fully 56% of the male students and 66% of the female students worked 20 hours or less per week. However, almost one-fifth of the males and 14% of the females worked over 30 hours per week.

In their study of high school students in the State of Washington, Schill et al. (1985) found that almost 70% of the students who were employed worked 20 hours or less per week. Hotchkiss (1986) in his analysis of the SOI data on hours worked in the sophomore and junior years showed that sophomores worked an average of 187 hours during the school year while the average for juniors was almost double that or 361 hours. If we assume that there are 35 weeks in a school year, then the sophomores averaged 5.3 hours of work per week and the juniors 10.3 hours per week.

In the MTF study, students were asked the average number of hours worked per week over the school year (Bachman et al., 1980). Of the students who worked, 23% worked 10 hours or less per week, 36% 11-20 hours per week, 28% 21-30 hours, and 11% more than 30 hours per week. Males averaged more hours per week than females and whites more hours than blacks.

The final study which assessed hours worked was the FFJ (Charner and Fraser, 1984). In that study, one-fifth of fast food employees aged 14-17 years old worked 15 or fewer hours per week, but almost one-third of this group worked more than 30 hours week.

When we look at the hours worked by high school students, a number of conclusions can be reached. First, the majority of students who are employed

while in high school work less than 20 hours per week. Second, a substantial proportion (between 10% and 33% in the different studies) work over 30 hours per week. Third, male students tend to work somewhat more hours per week than female students. Fourth, minority students work fewer hours per week than white students. Finally, seniors average considerably more hours worked per week than students in lower grades.

Wages

The wages paid to high school students are generally low. In the analysis that follows, wages are presented in dollars for the year that the data were collected. While conversion to a constant dollar base would help if we were making comparisons across studies, our purpose is more descriptive and therefore variable dollar bases will suffice.

Stevenson (1978), in his analysis of the NLS, found that white male students in 1966 had average earnings of \$1.50 per hour, while black males averaged \$1.39 per hour. Female students in 1968 had earnings that averaged \$1.23 per hour for Whites and \$1.21 per hour for blacks. When average weekly earnings were calculated for these student groups, they showed white males averaging \$29.18 per week compared to \$22.41 for black males, \$20.20 for white females, and \$19.28 for black females. Clearly, the pay advantages accrued to males over females and whites over Blacks.

Analysis of the DOL-NLS of students in 1978 by Lewis et al. (1983) found mean hourly earnings of \$3.15 for males and \$2.97 for females. For male students, almost one-quarter earned over \$3.50 per hour with less than 20% earning \$2.50 per hour or less. Female students were far more likely to earn less per hour. Fully one-third of the females had hourly earnings of \$2.50 or less while only 10% were making over \$3.50 per hour. When weekly income was calculated, Lewis et al. found means of \$74.15 for male and \$62.22 for female students. Thirty-four percent of the male students and 56% of the female

students had weekly incomes of \$50 or less. At the other end of the spectrum, 22% of the males and 14% of the females had weekly earnings of over \$100.

According to Lewin-Epstein (1981), mean hourly wages for the HSB students of 1980 were \$2.63 for sophomores and \$3.28 for seniors. Mean hourly wages were less for females than males, but the differences decreased from sophomore to senior years. Specifically, the mean hourly wages for male and female sophomores was \$3.02 and \$2.24, respectively, while for seniors hourly wages were \$3.42 and \$3.11 for males and females. For sophomores, 59% of the females had hourly earnings of less than \$2.50 compared to 23% of the males. At the same time a higher proportion of males (22%) earned \$3.50 or more per hour than did females (8%). By the senior year only 5% of males earned less than \$2.50 per hour and over one-third earned \$3.50 or more. The corresponding figures for females were 14% earning less than \$2.50 per hour and 16% earning \$3.50 or more per hour. It is interesting to note that in these data white sophomores had hourly wages that were lower than for blacks and Hispanics (means of \$2.60, \$2.78, and \$2.89, respectively). By the senior year these differences all but disappeared, with mean wages at \$3.27 per hour for whites and blacks and \$3.31 for Hispanics.

In terms of average weekly earnings, the findings showed that male sophomores averaged \$45.49 compared to \$24.98 for females. Senior males averaged \$72.79 per week compared to \$57.28 for females.

In the MTF study, students were asked how much money they got from a job during an average week. Almost one-half of the 1980 seniors who worked earned over \$50 per week. Only 17% had weekly earnings of \$20 or less. A higher proportion of males than females and whites than blacks had weekly income from a job of over \$50. Charner and Fraser (1984) in their study of fast food employment in 1982-83 found mean hourly wages of \$3.39 for 14-15 year olds and \$3.46 for 16-17 year olds.

In terms of wages these diverse data sets show that most high school students who work have relatively low hourly wages and low weekly incomes. In the late 1960's the mean hourly wages were in the \$1.20 - \$1.50 range. By the late 1970's and early 1980's, the mean hourly wage rates had more than doubled. Increases in average weekly income were even more profound, almost tripling. In every case male students were found to have higher average hourly earnings and average weekly income than their female peers. Larger proportions of female than male students were found in the lower wage categories and larger proportions of males than females in the upper wage categories. Also, minority students tended to have lower wages than whites in almost every study.

Training on the Job

Only one study has examined the nature of the training young people receive on the job. In the study of fast food employment (Charner and Fraser, 1984), employees were asked how much training was received from different sources. The largest single source of training was on-the-job experience. Fully 90 percent of the employees received some or a lot of training through on-the-job experience. The second largest source of training was coworkers. Three-quarters of these employees received at least some training from coworkers. Many employees received a basic orientation to the job and then were expected to learn the fine points while performing their various duties.

In terms of other store or company personnel who provided training to hourly employees, assistant managers (58%) and managers (54%) most often provided training. Crew chiefs or supervisors provided some or a lot of training to 45 percent of the employees and special trainers to 32 percent. Two other methods of training were used by fast food restaurants: films or slides and printed instructions. Almost half of these employees reported that training films or slides were used (some or a lot) in their training, while 40 percent received some or a lot of training through printed instructions.

There were a number of interesting differences between older and younger fast food employees in the sources of training. Older employees were more likely to receive training from managers than were younger employees while assistant managers provided training to a higher proportion of younger than older employees. A lower proportion of employees 21 years old or older (68%) received training from coworkers than did employees who were 20 years old or younger (77%). And, older employees were more likely than younger employees to receive training through printed instructions.

In the same study, fast food employees were asked how helpful was the training they received. On-the-job experience was reported to be helpful by the largest proportion of employees (94%). Coworkers (82%), special trainers (76%), assistant managers (73%), managers (72%), and crew chiefs (69%) were also considered to be helpful training sources. No differences in the perceived helpfulness of these sources were found between younger and older fast food employees. With regard to training by district managers, area managers, and printed materials there were differences found. In each case a larger proportion of employees over 20 years old found the source of training to be helpful than did their younger coworkers.

Social-Psychological Dimensions

Despite a well established research base on the social-psychological dimensions of adult work experience, little has been done on this dimension of youth work. Only one study has attempted to assess the social-psychological dimension of student work experiences. Greenberger et al. (1982) compared and contrasted six common youth jobs with regard to opportunities for learning, initiative, or autonomy. Ninety-one students in their first jobs were observed continuously for 46 to 147 minutes. The six job categories were food service, retail sales, clerical, manual labor, operatives/skilled labor, and cleaning.

In terms of opportunities for learning, there were substantial differences among the different categories. Compared to others, clerical workers spent the greatest proportions of time in reading, writing, arithmetic, and original production. They also had the highest rate of interaction with supervisors. Operatives/skilled laborers had the highest frequency of training, while those employed in cleaning spent the most time with supervisors.

Comparisons of opportunities for initiative and autonomy show that those in food service, retail, and skilled labor had the highest frequency of influencing others. Food service workers and manual laborers had the highest task variability and cleaners the least varied tasks. Food service, clerical, and retail workers worked under the most time pressures.

Opportunities for social interaction also differed across the six jobs. Food service work involved, by far, the highest rate of interaction with others. Youth who worked in food service, retail, and clerical jobs had higher rates of interaction with adults than did their peers in other jobs. Operatives/skilled laborers and food service workers spent a higher proportion of their time and had higher rates of interaction with peers than did other workers.

The Greenberg et al. (1982) analyses show that the jobs students hold differ substantially on social-psychological dimensions. Different jobs offer different opportunities for learning, initiative, autonomy, and social interaction.

Summary

Recognizing the limitations on the data with regard to differences in measurement and in the dimensions of work addressed, we are still able to put together a mosaic of the nature of student work experiences.

- o Students are found working in all industries but they tend to be concentrated in wholesale/retail trade, service, and agriculture/forestry/fishing.
- o Students work in most occupational groups but cluster in five occupations: operatives, service workers, laborers, sales workers,

and farm laborers.

- o Differences in the types of jobs students hold are found due to gender, grade level, and school program.
- o Over one-third of eleventh and almost half of twelfth graders work at least half the school year.
- o About one-fourth of students work all three years while in high school and another one-quarter work for two of the three years.
- o The majority of students work less than twenty hours per week but a fairly large proportion (10%-30%) work over 30 hours per week.
- o Male students tend to work more hours than female students and whites work more hours than minority students.
- o Hours worked per week is related to the age/grade of the students.
- o Most high school students have low wages averaging around the prevailing minimum wage.
- o Males have higher hourly wages than females and minority students have lower wages than white students.
- o Weekly income, in the more recent studies, averages \$60-\$75 with males having higher weekly incomes than females.
- o In fast food jobs, the largest single source of training is on-the-job experience. This is, however, most often supplemented by training from managers, assistant managers, supervisors, films, and printed instructions. Almost all sources of training were perceived as being helpful by the fast food employees.
- o The jobs student hold differ on a number of social-psychological dimensions including opportunities for learning, initiative, and social interaction.

V. WORK ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

While a fair amount has been written on the patterns and nature of student work experiences, there has been little examination of the specific roles and responsibilities of students in their jobs. It seems that there are two common assumptions in the literature. First, and most widely accepted, is that youth perform jobs that require little skill and involve little responsibility. Second, that students who are employed in work situations perform the same tasks and have similar responsibilities as adults in the same jobs. Both assumptions appear to be based on little empirical evidence. The tendency is to classify the jobs youth hold based on accepted "adult" occupational schemes. For example, a number of studies employ the Duncan Socioeconomic Index (SEI) which is based on an estimation of an occupation's educational requirements, earnings, and prestige (Schill et al., 1985; Hotchkiss, 1986). The SEI is used in these studies as an indication of the prestige of an occupation. Student jobs are coded using the SEI, and the results show that the mean SEI for students is low. While the SEI is a prestige ranking system, the assumption is that low scores reflect lower skill and responsibility levels, an assumption that may be true generally but erroneous for specific occupations or for the specific jobs youth may hold.

A second occupational scheme that has been used in at least one study assesses the content levels of occupations. According to Lewis et al. (1983), the great majority of jobs held by high school students required little skill and involved little complexity or responsibility. Using a five point measure of job content level, the authors found that over three-quarters of the jobs held by both male and female high school students were at the two lowest content levels. It is interesting, however, that almost one-quarter of the jobs females held and 22% of those males held were at the intermediate content level or above. Unfortunately, the nature of the content level measure used by Lewis et

al. (1983) employed a general determination of the content level of occupations and assessed scores accordingly. Such a procedure may mask the actual skill levels of these jobs. Clearly, two individuals employed as crew members in a fast food restaurant may differ with respect to skills required or responsibilities. For example, in some fast food restaurants crew members are responsible for hiring, training, and supervising workers in addition to preparing food and taking food orders. The skills required of these crew members would seem to be at a higher content level than those of a crew member who does no more than what is traditionally believed to be the job of a food service employee: taking food orders, preparing food, and operating a cash register. While the very nature of the part-time jobs students hold would seem to suggest low skill requirements and low levels of responsibility, this may, in fact, not be the case.

Very few studies have examined the roles and responsibilities of youth in their jobs. Charner and Fraser (1984), in their study of fast food employment, looked at job tasks and primary store responsibilities of hourly employees. They found that fast food employees performed multiple tasks associated with serving customers, preparing food, cleaning, and training and supervising employees. In most instances, fast food employees had primary duties for which they were responsible. A number of differences in primary responsibilities were found among age groups. Almost one-third of the hourly employees who were 21 years old or older had primary responsibility for administrative tasks such as hiring, training, and supervising workers. This compared to less than 20% of younger workers whose primary responsibility was administrative. Younger employees were more likely than older employees to have primary responsibility for "front of the store" duties (taking orders, taking money, assembling orders, and "suggestive selling"), "back of the store" duties (cooking and preparing food), and hosting in the dining area. In fast food jobs, at least, it appears

that while young workers perform multiple tasks, they are more likely to be responsible for the "lower level" tasks of taking orders and preparing food and less likely to have administrative (higher level) responsibilities.

Greenberger and Steinberg (1986) report that the typical young person in her or his first job spends more than one-quarter of the time cleaning things or carrying things. They go on to suggest that "most jobs are characterized by little task variety, highly routinized activity, and the constant repetition of fairly uninteresting tasks" (1986:66). Unfortunately, their analysis goes no further. They do not account for the other 75% of the young workers' time, and they do not discuss the roles and responsibilities young people have on their jobs.

While youth jobs are frequently characterized as being low skilled and low responsibility, few studies have examined the actual tasks and activities that young people do or are responsible for in their jobs. Measures such as the SEI and the content level of jobs suffer from assigning scores based on generalizations of adult occupations. And, the vast majority of studies have not asked about typical job duties or assignments. While we would not argue that youth jobs should be characterized as requiring high level skills or involving high level responsibilities, it does seem that others' generalizations are far too simplistic. More sophisticated and detailed analysis of youth work is needed before further conclusions can be drawn.

VI. THE EFFECTS OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN WORK ACTIVITIES

The information provided in the preceding sections points to the integral role that work plays in many teenagers' lives. The impact of work on the relationships and activities that are part of the high school experience is, therefore, a critical question, one which unfortunately does not lend itself to easy or definitive answers.

In an effort to categorize the many effects of student work on a variety of issues, we examine the impacts of work on: 1) school achievement, activities, and educational plans; 2) post-high school employment, earnings, and career development; 3) youth attitudes and behaviors in the workplace and the community; and 4) family and peer group relationships.

School Achievement, Activities, and Educational Plans

One of the important issues that needs to be examined is the impact of student work experience on academic achievement. The question looked at in several studies is whether working, and specifically whether working longer hours, leads to lower grade point averages (GPAs) and lower class rankings, both accepted indicators of academic standing. According to Sewell and Hauser (1976), high school grades are good predictors of educational achievement, which in turn plays a critical role in the process of occupational and income attainment.

Lewis et al. (1983), in their analysis of NLS data, found that work experience had no or only small effects on grades and class ranking, depending on gender. While there were no effects on GPA or class rankings for men, the data showed that work experience for women had a small negative relationship with GPA but a small positive relationship with class ranking. Lewis et al. placed more weight on the class ranking findings as better measures of relative performance since they are less sensitive to grading practices across schools and to skewness in the distribution of grades.

D'Amico (1984) found no adverse effects on class rank for any race or gender group of students who worked, regardless of the number of hours worked per week. According to his data, working students simply did not appear to have impaired academic achievement. Further, he found that high school employment significantly improved the class standing of white males, lending support to the notion that work "may actually foster behaviors or traits in students that promote academic success" (1984: 153).

When Schill et al. (1985) categorized the hours of employment for the students in their Washington State study into those not employed, those employed 20 hours a week or less, and those employed over 20 hours a week, hours of employment were found to have a statistically significant curvilinear relationship to GPA. In other words, employed students who worked 20 hours or less had higher average GPAs than students who were not employed and students who worked more than 20 hours. While the nature of their data did not allow causal inferences to be made, Schill et al. speculated on the possibility that higher achievement may serve as a screening device for employers or that the more able student is capable of taking on greater responsibilities and time-consuming activities, such as employment.

In the cross-sectional component of the Orange County study, Greenberger and Steinberg (1986) found that longer hours of work were associated with lower GPAs. Whether or not a student worked was less likely to make a difference in GPA than the number of hours worked. Tenth graders who worked more than 15 hours a week and 11th graders who worked more than 20 hours a week had significantly lower grades for that school year than students who worked less. The researchers go on to hypothesize, however, that these findings may result from students who do not expect to do well in school selecting longer hours of work. This hypothesis gains strength from the fact that the longitudinal component of their study "failed to confirm the alternative hypothesis, that

working long hours leads to lower grades" (1986:117).

The selection hypothesis is also supported, albeit weakly, by Mortimer and Finch's YIT analysis (1986) of high school males. They found that boys who worked during the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades tended to have lower GPAs in the ninth grade, before the majority of them would have entered the labor force.

Mortimer and Finch also found that those students who did not work at all during high school had higher GPAs (2.76) than those who worked two years (2.60) or three years (2.53) during high school. Working for one year was not associated with a significant decline in academic achievement, nor were significant differences found in academic self-concept or educational aspirations between those who worked one year and those who did not work at all. Students who worked all three years had the lowest educational attainment. Mortimer and Finch (1986) concluded that part-time youth employment, particularly when it is highly absorbing over a lengthy period with long working hours, can diminish commitment to school academic performance and can weaken educational aspirations.

Hotchkiss, on the other hand, in his analysis of the longitudinal SOI data (1986), found that the data did not support the hypothesis that work interferes with schooling. He investigated the effects of part-time work during high school on the following school-related behaviors: days tardy during school year; days absent during school year; number of extracurricular activities, transcripts' grade average, and self-reported grades. Hotchkiss' investigation "did not reveal any deleterious side effects of working during high school" (1986:111). Hours of work were found to have neither a linear nor curvilinear effect on any of the school-related variables. As Hotchkiss points out, this finding contradicts the contention that hours spent on the job interferes with schooling and stands in direct contradiction to Greenberger and Steinberg's finding of a possible curvilinear relationship between school grades and hours

of work.

The contrasting findings between Hotchkiss (1986) and D'Amico (1984), on the one hand, and Greenberger and Steinberg (1986), on the other, may grow out of the fact that the Orange County study focused on first-time employees only, while Hotchkiss and D'Amico included all students who were working, whether in their first job or fifth. D'Amico suggests that perhaps young workers and those with little work experience have initial difficulties in dealing with conflicting demands on their time, while those with more experience have learned how to budget their time more efficiently.

In addition to examining the effect of work on class ranking, D'Amico (1984) also analyzed the relationship of work intensity to other school-related variables, including hours spent studying and free time at school. The results showed that more extensive work involvement was associated with decreased hours spent studying and decreased free time at school for some gender and race groups. The percent of weeks worked more than 20 hours per week was significantly associated with reduced study time for white males and white females and appeared to limit free time spent at school for white males. Yet, despite the time-use tradeoffs, these students did not appear to have impaired academic achievement. D'Amico speculates that working youth may rob small amounts of time from a variety of activities, such as watching television, helping with housework, and sleeping, rather than from a single activity.

In the HSB study, Lewin-Epstein (1981) looked at the number of hours students spent on homework and watching television each week in relation to the time spent at work during the week prior to the survey. He found that male and female sophomores spent approximately the same amount of time on homework regardless of the time spent at work. Senior students who worked, particularly males and those who worked more than 20 hours a week, seemed to spend somewhat less time doing homework. In the case of senior males, there was a decrease

from four to three hours in the amount of time spent on homework. He also found that those who worked more than 20 hours a week spent 20% less time watching television and slightly less time reading for pleasure than students who did not work at all. Lewin-Epstein speculates that there seems to be a departure from school-based activities and a more central role for work among seniors which may have to do with the types of jobs held by seniors and the greater commitment required by those jobs.

In the FFJ study, when asked if their job interfered with their schoolwork, 35% of the 14-17 year old respondents agreed that it did, while 46% disagreed and 18% remained neutral. In a related question, the fast food employees were asked whether they did better or worse in school now that they were working. Twenty-one percent of the 14-17 year olds indicated that they did worse in school, while 12% said that they did better now that they were working (Charner and Fraser, 1984).

Data from the Orange County study regarding "investment" in schooling showed that students who worked spent less time on homework, participated in fewer extracurricular activities, and were absent more frequently from school than students who did not work. Investment in school was found to be positively and substantially related to GPA, or as Greenberger and Steinberg state: "Reduced investment in school probably leads to poorer academic performance" (1986:123). Again, however, this may be due to the fact these researchers only looked at students in their first jobs who may have difficulties balancing their time commitments.

Regarding the issue of homework, McNeil in her 1984 study of four Wisconsin high schools included interviews with teachers who told her that in response to increased student employment and decreased involvement in school, they assigned less homework and cut down on the number of long-term assignments and the amount of outside reading required. According to McNeil, "The more students worked, and

for longer hours, the less some teachers required of them at school. The more school became boring and less demanding, the more students increased their work hours" (1984:5). She maintains that students' part-time jobs were a key factor in lowering teachers' expectations of their students.

The question of what effects part-time student employment has on school completion and educational plans is related to the issue of lowered expectations. D'Amico (1984) found that very extensive work involvement (more than 20 hours per week) was associated with an increase in dropping out for white male sophomores and white female juniors, suggesting that very intensive work involvement at an early age may distract some youth from their educational progression. On the other hand, it was found that less intensive work involvement (1-20 hours per week) of those in grade 11 (except for minority males) actually appeared to lead to increased rates of high school completion, suggesting some support for the congruence theory--that employment and classroom participation may reinforce each other by inculcating similar behaviors--and for the possibility that employment at what are usually low-wage jobs while in high school may attune youth to the need for educational credentials.

Steinberg (1982) reported that part-time employment had no impact on educational plans, according to the Orange County data. In regard to educational aspirations, Mortimer and Finch (1986) found that those individuals who had less intensive levels of employment in high school expressed a stronger commitment to obtaining further education, when followed up five years after graduation. While still in high school, these respondents reported higher aspirations for post-secondary education and, in fact, five years after graduation they had achieved more years of education than those with more intensive levels of employment during high school.

In their study of fast food employees, Charner and Fraser (1984) found that 63% of the workers expected to graduate from a four-year college with an

additional 19% expecting to complete some college or to graduate from a two-year college. In fact, over three-fourths of those employees who were eligible to continue their education beyond high school had done so.

Given the importance of determining the impact of work during high school on school achievement, activities, and educational aspirations and plans, the sparsity of available data points to a significant gap in our knowledge of such impacts for youth in naturally occurring jobs. (Evaluations of the Youth Employment and Training Program and the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Project sponsored under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act do provide limited information on rates of school retention and graduation among disadvantaged youth.)

Post-High School Employment, Earnings, and Career Development

Given the large number of high school students who work, an important question that needs to be examined is what impact working and hours of work have on later employment, earnings, and career development. Specifically, does working during high school affect labor market experience in early adulthood? Do these effects persist over time?

Using NLS data, Freeman and Wise (1979) and Meyer and Wise (1982) found that part-time work experience while in school was positively associated with employment (measured in weeks worked) and with income in the year immediately following high school. These findings are to be expected when looked at together with findings from the High School and Beyond study that show 62% of working students who were planning to work upon high school graduation had already lined up a job, as compared to only 31% of those who were not already working.

The likelihood of having a job lined up also varied by the type of job held during the senior year. Approximately three-quarters of the students in health-related and factory jobs and 85% of those in skilled trades who were planning to work right after high school had jobs lined up that tended to be

the same jobs held during school. Students who did odd jobs, food service, and babysitting (the more traditional adolescent jobs) had the lowest proportion of jobs lined up after high school and were the least likely to continue in the same type of job. From these data, Lewin-Epstein (1981) concludes that certain jobs provide more opportunity for continuity and a smooth transition into adult careers. Evidently, work during school in such jobs as skilled trades, health fields, and factories serves as an entry mechanism into the adult labor market, particularly for those students who do not continue their schooling beyond high school. For such students, the type of job held during school plays an important role in their transition to adult jobs.

When Lewis et al. (1983) examined the NLS data for the first two years out of high school for respondents who were not enrolled in any educational activity, high school work experience was found to have few significant effects on subsequent hourly or weekly job earnings. It did have a significant positive effect on employment during the first two years after high school; those with work experience during school spent relatively less time unemployed.

Mortimer and Finch found in their 1986 analysis of the YIT data (males only) that increased student work, whether measured in terms of labor force participation while in high school, the duration of employment, hours, or pay, appeared to have "short-term" advantages for economic attainment. This was true both for those who entered the full-time labor market as well as for those who continued to work while receiving further education. Five years after high school those who had worked during school reported about 27% higher earnings than those who had not worked. Despite this early economic advantage, the authors caution that there are longer-run disadvantages: "The student who becomes highly involved in work while still in high school acquires weaker educational credentials. Given that there are not enough jobs in the primary labor market to go around, his chances in the competition for the higher-paying,

more secure, and career-like employment is [sic] therefore reduced" (1986:87).

The question in need of further research, based on the studies cited above, is to examine more closely who benefits in the short-term and long-term from work experience during high school, where the trade-offs occur, and what the optimal duration and intensity of work involvement are for different sub-groups of youth and for differing categories of jobs in terms of a successful transition from youth to adult labor markets.

Youth Attitudes and Behaviors

Another important area that is affected by employment during high school is the development of attitudes and behaviors relating to the workplace and to the community at large. This includes the development of personal coping skills, general employability skills, and acceptance of responsibilities.

In her 1982 study of youth preparation for work, Snedeker found that working youth acquired, at a minimum, basic communication skills, the ability to cooperate, and appropriate modes of dress. She also maintained that even marginal jobs require self-discipline, a mobilization of effort, and application to a task.

Charner and Fraser (1984) examined the impact of fast food jobs on general employability skills, theorizing that such skills are important for future success in obtaining jobs and progressing in a career, as well as for functioning as a member of a family or community. When asked whether the fast food job had helped them learn specific skills, the 14-17 year-old respondents indicated that the job helped: 87% of them learn to deal with customers; 79% to get along with coworkers; 77% to take directions; 72% to take responsibility for mistakes; 70% to finish an assigned task; 65% learn about being dependable (coming to work regularly); 62% learn about being on time; 61% to budget (get along on a certain amount of money without borrowing or asking parents for more); and 60% to manage their own money and to save for what they want. Younger employees more than

older employees indicated that the fast food job helped them learn these skills. For some, it was the primary arena for learning them, rather than at home or in school.

Greenberger and Steinberg (1986) and Cole (1980) reported similar findings in their studies. Their results confirmed that for youth, working is a way to acquire useful world of work knowledge, including: how the business world runs; how to find and keep a job; how to manage money; how to get along with other people.

Regarding changes in youth's level of responsibility, Greenberger and Steinberg found that girls who worked gained greater feelings of self-reliance. Working was also found to enhance young people's view of themselves as having good work habits. Finally, they reported that working led to increased financial autonomy which they felt represented "the most dramatic and unambiguous effect of working on adolescents' lives" (1986:105).

There seems to be general agreement in the literature that working while in high school does generally promote desirable work habits and world of work knowledge and skills, although Greenberger and Steinberger are troubled by findings that indicated a possible association between working and acceptance of unethical business practices by certain subgroups of youth. Specifically, acceptance of unethical practices by youngsters from blue-collar families did not seem to be affected by working, while tolerance of such practices apparently increased among youth from white-collar backgrounds and decreased among youngsters with fathers in the profession. Greenberger and Steinberg indicate that this finding is rather complicated with no consistent pattern. As theirs is the only study to date that has looked at this variable, more examination is clearly indicated.

The Orange County study also reports that working appeared to lead to increased cynicism about work. In the cross-sectional study, workers believed

that work was less intrinsically rewarding or self-fulfilling than nonworkers. In the longitudinal study, working led to increased cynicism among white-collar and blue-collar youth. In contrast, however, working led to decreased cynicism among youth with fathers in the professions. Cynicism about work also appeared to be related to job environment. Not surprisingly, youth who worked under stressful job conditions - poor environmental conditions, perceived meaninglessness of work, and perception of an impersonal social environment - were more likely to endorse cynical statements about working.

Perhaps the area of greatest concern in terms of work and youth behavior is the impact of working on delinquency and deviant behavior. This is an issue of importance not just to the individuals concerned and their families but to the community in which they live. The question in need of examination is twofold: 1) does working lead to increased incidents of youth delinquency or deviant behavior and 2) does working lead to reduced incidents of delinquent or deviant behavior for youth?

There is little research on the relationship between youth working and delinquency. What evidence does exist is inconclusive and contradictory.

Using data from a longitudinal study of birth cohorts in Racine, Wisconsin from 1942 and 1949, Shannon (1982) found that employment while in high school was weakly and inconsistently related to delinquency. When police records were used as the outcome measure, there was a tendency for work during high school to be negatively associated with delinquency, reaching statistical significance for two of the eight subgroups in the sample. Contacts with the police also tended to be of a more serious nature for workers than nonworkers.

Gottfredson (1982) in her reanalysis of Youth in Transition data found that employment during high school had no effect on young men's delinquency, when earlier delinquency and other predictors of delinquency were statistically controlled. In her 1985 analysis of the School Action Effectiveness Study

(SAES), Gottfredson found that working youth and nonworking youth differed on a number of dimensions before they began to work, with females who worked reporting more behavior involving interpersonal aggression and more than twice as much drug use as their nonworking counterparts. Male workers reported lower levels of parental attachment than male nonworkers, and both male and female workers reported significantly greater involvement in extracurricular activities than did nonworkers. According to Gottfredson, these preexisting differences between workers and nonworkers accounted for the observed differences in delinquency levels between the groups.

Gottfredson concluded that "the preponderance of evidence from the studies on work and delinquency suggest that work as teenagers experience it has little or no effect on delinquency. The Youth in Transition, SAES, and Racine studies provide no support for the notion that working promotes or inhibits delinquency. Only the Orange County study suggested an effect of teenage employment on delinquent behavior" (1985:430).

As reported by Greenberger and Steinberg (1986), analysis of the Orange County data by Ruggiero found that workers performed more deviant acts involving money, substance use, and school than nonworkers. These deviant behaviors tended to be more strongly associated with intensity of employment than with working *per se*, and the data lent support to the conclusion that these deviant behaviors were a consequence of work experience rather than an antecedent condition affecting selection into the workforce. While the longitudinal study yielded fewer significant work-deviance relationships than its cross-sectional counterpart, it did show that working led to more frequent gambling among boys. Also, greater work exposure led to more overall money-related deviance among girls, to greater school-related deviance among boys, and to increases in substance use - alcohol consumption among boys and marijuana use among girls. Workers did not exceed nonworkers in more "traditional" types of delinquency: interpersonal aggression,

property damage, and theft. One of the most disturbing aspects of this set of findings was that it was precisely those youth who reported the lowest rates of involvement in traditional delinquent activities for whom working was most strongly associated with deviance involving substance use, money, and school. Ruggiero theorizes why working may increase these forms of deviance: "... it is through the provision of income and the production of job stress that work may promote [these] particular forms of deviance" (Greenberger and Steinberg, 1986:134).

Examining the impact of job stress more closely, it was found that high levels of job stress were consistently related to alcohol and marijuana use. Exposure to job stressors, on the other hand, was not related to use of drugs other than marijuana and was related inconsistently to cigarette smoking. Such exposure was also unrelated to job absence nor was it associated with physical or psychological symptoms.

In regard to workplace deviance, Greenberger and Steinberg found that 62% of their sample of first-time workers reported committing at least one act of deviance in the workplace. About 41% had committed some form of theft (e.g. giving away goods, putting extra hours on their timecard, taking money from work). About 45% had committed some form of non-theft deviance (e.g. calling in sick when not, working under influence of alcohol or drugs, lying to employer to get or keep job). Youth who were more materialistic, more cynical about work, and more tolerant of unethical workplace practices were more likely to engage in workplace deviance. The authors conclude: "Taken together, increased use of marijuana and alcohol as a function of job stress, increased cynicism about the value of work, and the rapid emergence, among first-time workers, of deviance in the workplace itself constitute a sobering set of outcomes" (1986:147).

Clearly, their findings warrant taking a closer look at these possible negative impacts of working through larger national samples of youth working

not just in their first jobs but those who have been in the labor market for an extended duration.

Family and Peer Group Relationships

Very limited information is available on the effects that working has on young workers' relationships with their families and friends. In the FFJ study, employees were asked how they thought their parents and friends felt about their working. Seventy-eight percent of the 14-17 year-old fast food employees said that their fathers approved, while 77% indicated that their mothers approved. When asked if they agreed with the statement that they got along better with their parents since they started the job, 25% said they did, while 22% disagreed.

Seventy-four percent thought that their friends approved of them working. Asked whether they agreed that they didn't see their friends as much as they'd like, 47% indicated agreement, while 26% were neutral and 26% disagreed. Twenty-two percent of the 14-17 year old employees (more than any other age group of employees) indicated that they were not satisfied with the way their time was scheduled on the job because it conflicted with other activities (school, religious, social). Yet over 90% of them said that they had made new friends on the job.

Overall, say Greenberger and Steinberg (1986), relationships with parents and siblings do not seem to be hurt by youth work. Generally, the parents approve of work as a healthy step towards maturity and a way to learn useful skills, but the authors express concern that the extensive involvement of youth in work may be related to the erosion of parental authority over their teenage children. More than half the workers in the Orange County study said they had gained more freedom since they started working, reporting that they ate dinner with their family less often, helped out less around the house, and spent less leisure time with their family. Specifically, both boys and girls spent less time with their families. Girls felt less close to their families as a result

of working, while girls from close families were less likely to work at all. Once on the job, girls became more self-reliant and more interested in future jobs that would allow them to make decisions. In addition, earning their own money gave both male and female workers some independence from parental control, with parents frequently reporting that they had no right to dictate what should be done with their youngsters' earnings.

As far as peer relations are concerned, Greenberger and Steinberg feel that the adolescent workplace, far from providing youth with adult role models, has become age-segregated, with young people working with and for other youth, serving to reinforce the existing youth culture. Schill et al. (1985) state that the working mother seems to provide a model for children's employment experience in the same manner as the working father. This may, in part, explain some of the impacts of work for girls, as noted earlier. Finally, Gottfredson (1985) reports that working has no effect on attachment to parents for either male or female youth.

With so few analyses available on the impact of youth working on their family and peer relationships, it is clear that no definitive conclusions can be reached until such analyses have been conducted.

Summary

It is obvious from the review that there are no easy or definitive answers regarding the effects of student participation in work activities. A summary of the impacts of work on school experiences, post-high-school outcomes, attitudes, and relationships is provided below.

- o With regard to the effect of working on grades the findings are mixed. There seems to be a curvilinear relationship between hours worked and grades, with 20 hours the "magical" cut-off for when a negative effect emerges.
- o There is no effect of working on class rank, days tardy or absent, or number of extracurricular activities.
- o Students who worked more than 20 hours per week spent somewhat less time on homework but also less time watching television.

- o Working appears to have little effect on educational plans. Students who worked more than 20 hours per week, however, had lower educational aspirations.
- o Student work experience is positively associated with employment and income after completion of high school in the short range.
- o Working students are more likely to have lined up a job after graduation than those who do not work during high school.
- o Working during high school promotes desirable work habits and world of work knowledge and skills.
- o The findings in regard to the effect of working on delinquent behavior are inconclusive and contradictory.
- o Fast food employees report that parents and friends generally approve of their working.
- o Generally, relationships with parents and siblings are not affected by working, albeit they do spend less time with their families.
- o There is a critical need for further research on the attitudinal and behavioral effects of students working in the personal, school, home, community, and work domains.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH

It is clear from this review and synthesis that there are major gaps in the information base and problems of comparability across studies. Our recommendations for research begin by identifying a general need for better information on youth and work and the need for a common set of measures related to youth and work. We conclude with a discussion of a proposed agenda for future research in this area.

General Needs

There is a general need for an improved and more comprehensive data base related to youth and work. Currently, there does not exist a single data base which examines the detailed patterns of student participation in work experiences; the multiple dimensions of the nature of these work experiences; the roles and responsibilities of students as workers; and the effects of differential work experiences on different educational, family, social, and personal short and long-term outcomes. Such a data set on a representative sample of students from different subgroups of the population is clearly needed. With such a data set, a more complete picture of the antecedents and consequences of student work experience could be developed and policy and program decisions grounded on more reliable information.

Such a data base should be longitudinal, tracking students over a long period of time, starting before high school and continuing at least ten years after high school. Longitudinal information is critical for: a) examining the reasons why students work in general and in specific jobs, b) tracking patterns of work experience, c) exploring the changing nature of work experiences over the early life-course, d) assessing the long as well as short-term consequences of student work, and e) exploring the relationships between work and other roles and responsibilities.

Related to this first recommendation is the need for a common set of measures on: working, the reasons for students working, the multiple dimensions of student work experiences, and the multiple attitudinal and behavioral outcomes of working. One of the major difficulties in undertaking this paper has been the lack of comparability across studies. While we recognize that most of the data bases reviewed in the paper were collected for reasons other than the examination of student work experience, their lack of comparability on the central variables related to youth and work is problematic. From the basic measure of working, to the description of occupations and industrial groups, to the various outcome measures, no two data bases are parallel.

A set of common questions needs to be developed which can be used by future researchers. These questions need to cover, at a minimum, the following:

- o work histories including: type of job, duration, hours worked, wages, length of employment, employer, and benefits;
- o multiple dimensions of work including: occupational self direction, position in the organizational structure, job pressures, and extrinsic risks and rewards;
- o reasons for working including: financial, experiential, learning, and social-psychological reasons;
- o outcomes including: attitudinal and behavioral outcomes, both short and long-term.

Proposed Research Agenda

The proposed research agenda on youth and work which follows is based on a number of assumptions. First, better information on the patterns, nature, and consequences of student work experiences is needed. Second, secondary analysis of existing data bases will add to our understanding of some of the issues. Third, alternative methods of data collection will provide important information. Finally, comparative studies can add to our understanding of the critical issues related to youth and work.

1. Comprehensive Data Set

The most critical piece of our proposed research agenda centers around the need for a comprehensive study of youth and work. We outlined the critical components of such a study earlier in this section of the paper. While such an effort is costly, the information it would provide is critical for future program and policy recommendations. Of particular importance is information in four areas. The first area is information on the reasons students report for working. The few studies which have assessed reasons limit the possibilities to financial and "learning" reasons. That is, they ask if students work for "spending" money, to help support their families, to save for education, to learn skills, or for the experience of working. No one has explored the possible social-psychological reasons for working such as: boredom, too much free time, peer or family pressure, as an alternative to being home or "hanging out," or as a way of succeeding or achieving.

The second area is information on the work histories of students. It is important to know more about the type of work experiences students have, including: job descriptions, hours, wages, and benefits, length of employment, occupational/industrial groups, type of employer, training, supervision, opportunities for learning, and reasons for learning.

A third area in need of better information is the dimensions of work. As discussed earlier, a great deal of research has been done on the multiple dimensions of adult occupations (Kohn, 1980; Kohn and Schooler, 1978, 1982). Parallel information is needed for youth work, particularly related to: work complexity routinization, closeness of supervision, bureaucratization, self-direction, pressures, autonomy, responsibilities, interaction with others, and initiative. It is clear from the research on adult jobs that job conditions or dimensions do affect personality and that personality affects job conditions. As Kohn and Schooler suggest, "implicit in all these findings is the consistent

implication that the principal process by which a job affects personality is one of straightforward generalization from the lessons of the job to life off the job" (1982:1282). It is critical to know if the same holds true for youth and their jobs. The findings of such analyses have important implications for policies and programs related to youth and work.

The final area in need of better information concerns the outcomes of student work. The majority of studies on the impact of work experience for youth focus on school related and deviant behavior factors. It is important to know more than if working affects students' time on homework, grades, educational aspirations, academic self-concept, use of cigarettes, or use of alcohol and drugs. Equally important are attitudinal and behavioral outcomes related to family, friends, current and future work, and the individual herself or himself, including but not limited to:

- o self-concept
- o skills, knowledge, and abilities
- o satisfaction
- o time on activities
- o goals and plans
- o values and preferences
- o interactions
- o socialization
- o educational, career, and life attainments
- o roles and responsibilities

Both short and long-term outcomes need to be assessed. We need to look beyond the immediate consequences of working on education, finances, and deviance to the longer term affects on personality, education, careers, and social roles and responsibilities.

2. Secondary Analyses

A number of small and large data sets contain information that relates to some of the issues on youth and work. These data sets offer an opportunity for secondary analysis. The High School and Beyond data base provides longitudinal information on a large number of high school students. Secondary analyses could assess the detailed nature of student work experience, patterns of work experience, and effects of work experience. Of particular interest would be analyses of the effects of different work experiences on educational, personal, career, and other outcomes, both short and long-term. A number of specific secondary analyses are offered as examples of the potential of this data base:

- o Assessment of teacher perceptions of students with different patterns of work experience. The data base has teacher opinions of students related to college plans, working up to potential, popularity, dislike of school, and self-discipline. Analyses could examine the relationship between different patterns of work and teacher opinions for different groups of students.
- o Examination of the relationship between different patterns of work experience and attitudes about the future, others, and self for different groups of students. A wide array of attitudinal variables are measured in the data base and it would be of interest to determine if students with differing patterns of work differ on these attitudes.
- o Because of its longitudinal nature, HSB offers a unique opportunity to assess the longer term educational and career consequences of different patterns of high school work experience. Secondary analyses which examine the long term effects of work experience for different groups of students would add considerably to our knowledge base.

The DOL-NLS data base also provides valuable information for secondary analysis. The extensive work histories collected each survey year would allow for detailed investigation of the patterns and nature of student work experience. As with HSB, these data are longitudinal and could provide information on longer term effects of student work experience.

A number of other data sets offer the possibility for secondary analyses. While the Monitoring the Future (Bachman et al., 1980) data set has only limited information on student work, it does ask a large battery of questions on drug and alcohol use; attitudes about self, others, government, and future; and education

and career plans. Through secondary analysis of this data set, one could get a very complete picture of the effects of student work experience on drug and alcohol use as well as the relationship between work experience and attitudes and plans. In addition, the cross-sectional nature of the data allows for comparisons across groups of high school seniors from 1975 through 1983. Analyses could assess the changing social and economic conditions of the society between 1975 and 1983 and explore how these affected student work experiences.

The study of Significant Others' Influence (Hotchkiss and Chiteji, 1981) represents a unique data set for secondary analysis. Not only is the data set longitudinal, with students surveyed in their sophomore, junior, and senior years, but it also offers a detailed work history for each student. Changes in work patterns can be assessed as well as the effects of different work experiences on outcomes over time.

Finally, the National Study of Fast Food Employment (Charner and Fraser, 1984) represents a unique data set on the largest employer of youth. Analyses could explore the effects of fast food employment on attitudes, plans, skills, and behaviors for different groups of student who work at fast food jobs.

A variation on the secondary analysis theme is to undertake meta-analyses to synthesize the research on youth and work. Meta-analysis is the quantitative cumulation of results across studies (Glass, 1976, 1978; Glass et al., 1981). Glass (1976) defines meta-analysis as the combining of the results of independent studies for the purposes of integrating findings. Meta-analysis is conducted on a group of studies that are related, based on their common hypotheses or definitions of critical independent or dependent variables. By applying to a collection of results the same objective methods that researchers use in analyzing results from an individual study, meta-analysis allows one to draw reliable, reproducible, and general conclusions. Meta-analysis is especially helpful in the social sciences when researchers are interested in formulating

ecological rather than individual generalizations - generalizations about the findings in a population of settings rather than generalizations about a population of individuals in a single setting. Meta-analysis uses multivariate techniques to describe findings and to relate characteristics of studies to outcomes.

Meta-analysis should be undertaken to synthesize the research on student work experiences, especially related to educational, career, and other personal outcomes. Such a meta-analysis could help to answer several major questions surrounding youth work experience: Do different types of students have different patterns of work experience, and is the nature of work experience different for different groups of students? Do different types of work experiences have different effects? Does work experience affect certain types of outcomes for different types of students?

3. Alternative Data Collection Strategies

The majority of studies on youth and work are based on large scale survey data collection strategies. While these studies provide a great deal of information related to student work experiences, other strategies could provide "richer" data on a number of critical issues. For example, when students are asked why they work, the responses tend to focus around money, skill acquisition, and peer or family pressures. Small-scale studies, with intensive interviews, could be used to understand better those and other reasons for working. Through such interviews, the relative importance of each of these factors could be determined as well as reasons related to boredom, alternative ways of spending time, or alternative means of achievement and success. In-depth interviews can also shed light on: student perceptions of their work experiences; detailed descriptions of work experience focusing on the multiple dimensions of the job; the perceived impact of work on school, family, social, and personal factors; and the skills, knowledge, and attitudes learned through working.

Case studies are a second strategy for data collection that could provide detailed information on youth and work. Case studies employ a combination of observations, interviews, and document review to obtain a comprehensive and thorough picture of a program or group in its natural setting or own context.

Borman and Vreeberg (1986) have used the case study approach to examine training on the job for young employees ages 17-21. Employing a combination of observations and interviews over an 18-month period, detailed information was collected on training objectives, training instances, and employer responses to training. A similar approach could be used to collect information on: the nature of student work experiences in different job settings; the interaction with supervisors, customers, and co-workers; and the effects of working on school, family, social, and personal attitudes and behaviors. These case studies could also explore operations, hiring procedures, learning opportunities, work, and supervision of different employers of youth.

A growing arena of youth employment is the urban or suburban mall. Not only do these malls represent opportunities for youth employment, they also are often the center of social interaction outside of the school for students. An in-depth case study of the mall as employer and social setting for youth would add considerably to our information base on youth and work.

Another candidate for possible case study would be school-based programs that integrate education and paid work outside of school. There are a number of cooperative education, vocational/technical education, work experience, and other programs that could be studied to explore the array of issues surrounding student work experience as it interrelates with educational programs. Such case studies should examine: 1) how the work experience is integrated into the curriculum; 2) how assessment is done on the job; 3) how these experiences impact student attitudes, plans, and behaviors; and 4) how academic and work related skills are acquired by students.

The final area that would be fruitful for case study is student self-employment. In addition to babysitting and odd jobs, there is a substantial group of students who run their own businesses. It is not uncommon to find students working on their own at small-appliance repair, lawn care, tutoring, giving horse-back riding or other lessons, house painting, and the like. Case studies of students in these kinds of self-employment would be most enlightening. The case studies should explore, among other things, how the individual got started, the nature of the work experience, the skills and knowledge gained, the benefits and costs, the impact on attitudes and behaviors, and the longer term impact on future plans and attainments. These case studies would provide an information base on an aspect of student work experience that has received little empirical attention.

4. Comparative Studies of Youth and Work

Studies of youth and work issues in other countries can provide an important base for comparisons. Through comparative studies, differences in the processes related to youth and work and differences in the outcomes of these processes can be identified. The uncovering of parallels and contrasts between our own system and those of other countries will contribute to a greater understanding of youth and work. Hamilton (1987), for example, has examined the apprenticeship system for high school students in West Germany. His analysis and findings on the dual system of apprenticeship and part-time vocational schooling suggests that this approach results in students having "a clear, direct, and functional path into careers that is absent in the United States" (1987:329). He goes on to state:

The West Germany dual system is important as a counterexample, challenging the unstated assumption that schools are the only or even the best settings for learning. A German word, Schulmudigkeit, meaning school weariness, identifies a problem that their system recognizes, while ours blames the victim. Classroom instruction has failed to engage the interest and improve the performance of a substantial proportion of youth and will continue to fail if it is only intensified. Out of school learning is a viable alternative (1987:330).

A great deal can be learned from this type of comparative study. Studies of the transition processes and youth and work policies and practices of other countries have significant implications for our own society.

Summary

The recommendations for research put forth in this section grow out of two related concerns. First, there are major gaps in the information base related to youth and work. A great many conclusions about the nature, costs, and benefits of student work experience have been made based on a relatively limited base of information. There is a clear need for a better and more comprehensive data base that can be generated through a set of related secondary analyses and new data collection activities.

The second concern revolves around the preparation of youth for adult roles and responsibilities. The decade of the 1980's was ushered in with a "tidal wave" of reports and studies on American education. Despite the impressive reform efforts for educational excellence, little has been done to explore the issues surrounding the relative import of different institutions in the preparation of youth for adult roles and responsibilities.

The importance of better understanding the nature of student work experience and its effects on schooling, goals, personal growth, and career development is clear. And, the need for an improved research base on the myriad of issues related to youth and work should be equally apparent.

VIII. POLICY AND PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS: AN ACTION AGENDA

Developing new and better sources of information on youth and work, as outlined in the preceding section, is critical if we are to formulate appropriate, timely, and effective policies and programs to address the multiple aspects and effects of young people working while in school. Yet, we cannot simply wait to take action until we have more information. We need to move forward on a parallel course of program and policy initiatives. The knowledge base is adequate regarding some of the costs and benefits associated with youth work experience to move forward in a number of critical areas. And the number of youth currently working argues for the urgency of taking steps immediately.

In an age of enormous federal budget deficits and increasing demands on state and local governments, fiscal realities intrude on any effort to introduce new programs and policies. Recognizing, however, that our nation's political and economic future rests on the positive and productive behaviors of its citizenry, we believe that none of the costs of the proposals made herein is too high a price to pay to ensure the educational and economic futures of its youngest participants. We begin with a general recommendation, then move into a set of specific program and policy options.

Building on this Paper

In Sections II - VI of this paper we reviewed and synthesized the available information on youth and work. There is a critical need for others to look at our review with an eye toward arriving at some generalizations and conclusions. Our first recommendation is that a set of formal mechanisms and structures be put in place to convene groups of educators, employers, youth agency personnel, government officials, researchers, and experts on youth. These groups should use this paper as a springboard for framing and examining key issues related to youth and work and for recommending future directions for policies and practices in this arena.

Education and Information Programs

One of the areas that is most in need of attention is the provision of timely and accurate information on the nature and effects of work experience for all those affected. Many young people are inadequately informed about the responsibilities associated with a job, while many of their parents are unaware of the impact that working may have on their children's other activities and relationships. Teachers only rarely are informed of the jobs their students hold and what they do in those jobs. Few of the subjects they teach relate to the work experience and skills their students are gaining outside the classroom. Counselors frequently devote most of their time to the current and future educational needs of students, with little time and attention paid to working students and the reciprocal effects of school and work. Employers generally have little or no contact or communication with employees' teachers or counselors and know little about ways to initiate and maintain linkages with schools for individual employees. And, finally, community organizations with a large stake in the future educational and occupational well-being of their citizenry rarely serve as providers of communication or linkages among all the parties in the community affected by young people who work while in school. There is an important gap here that can be filled by implementing new information and education programs for each and all of these groups. Specific examples of education and information programs for parents, students, teachers, counselors, employers, and community groups are provided below:

Parents: Information needs to be provided to parents of youth who work or wish to work on the benefits and costs of youth employment while in school; questions they should ask regarding the job and possible effects on schooling, social life, and other activities; issues relating to student earnings, control of those earnings, and parental involvement in their expenditure; possible impacts on family roles and responsibilities; and parental supervision of the

work experience through contacts with the employer and with school. Such information should be made available through the schools, employers, community organizations, or a central clearinghouse on youth employment. Local television and radio shows also could be used to deliver important information to parents as well as to the other constituencies identified above.

Students: Young people who are in school and are working or interested in working should have access to a range of information and counseling regarding what to look for in a job; how to make the most of the work experience; what the trade-offs are between working, school, extracurricular activities, family and social life; how to maintain channels of communication among parents, teachers, and employers regarding the work experience; how to budget their time; how to handle their earnings; how to deal with conflicting roles and responsibilities; how to deal with the pressures of the workplace; how to recognize when and if work begins to interfere with other activities and what to do about it. First-time workers, in particular, need support services and assistance with: how to budget their time; how to deal with supervisors; how to handle problems in school and at work as they arise; and how to deal with parents, friends, teachers, and outside responsibilities and activities when they conflict with work and/or school.

Teachers: Given the fact that so many young people are working while still in school, teachers need new ways of relating education to work and work to education without lowering their standards and expectations. They need access to curricula that integrate the subjects young people are learning in school with the jobs they are working in after school. Projects that use work experience as a vehicle for instruction might include such activities as:

- o Tracing the history of one of the major employers of youth (e.g. Roy Rogers or McDonald's) to learn historical method and research;
- o Writing essays on work roles in English class to learn how to organize a paper or to check spelling, grammar, syntax, etc.;

- o Simulating how a business operates (a local fast food franchise, perhaps) as a firsthand approach to studying economics; or
- o Examining workplace art and architecture as a reflection of the culture and the historical period.

Counselors: Given the high ratio of students to counselors in most high schools, it is not surprising that the majority of counselors are hard-pressed to serve the immediate and longer-range educational needs of their students, let alone the occupational needs of students who are not planning to continue their education beyond high school. Yet, many high schools do have offices that are designed to help students plan for their future careers. Few of them offer substantial assistance to students looking for part-time work while still in school, beyond maintaining a listing of openings in the local community. Even fewer have established links to major employers of youth. Most employers would welcome the opportunity for an on-going relationship with school representatives. Counselors need to learn how to establish linkages with employers, using these linkages to keep employers informed of employees' educational progress or problems that may be related to work, as well as having the employers keep the school informed of students' progress at work, thereby opening up channels of communication between young people's school and work experiences. In addition, school employment offices should offer students who are working or wish to work a full range of counseling and advisory services (see listing above under "Students").

Employers: With so many young people working while still in school, employers need to be better informed about the impacts of working on their employees' schoolwork, extracurricular activities, other activities, and, importantly, on youth's development of attitudes toward work and the workplace in general. Linkages with schools play a critical role in making employers aware of their stake in encouraging young employees to do well in school. They may wish to move away from providing financial rewards as incentives for good

work towards greater use of educational incentive programs (e.g. a mini-G.I. bill for workers linked to length of employment) or programs that offer workers higher levels of responsibility and skill in the workplace. Models of such programs are already being implemented by some major employers of youth.

Employers also need to be informed regarding how to make the work experience more relevant to education, perhaps taking time to relate specific work roles to subjects studied in school. Communicating with schools regarding individual employees' progress at work, through regular reports to teachers or counselors, is another area employers need to consider. Schools and employers should consider adopting a "2.0 or better" policy, similar to that applied by many schools to participation in extracurricular activities. If a working student's GPA falls below 2.0, the school informs the employer who then either cuts back on the number of working hours for that student or places the employee on "educational leave," with the guarantee that the student can return to work once the GPA is brought up. Such a program would also involve the active participation of the student and her/his parents. Such a communication channel between school and employer will benefit the school, the employer, and, most important, the working student.

Community organizations: The local community has a large interest in the effects of employment on its youth. Efforts to enhance the work experiences of young people and ameliorate possible negative impacts of such work should be of primary concern to all groups affected by the development of youth into responsible citizens of and contributors to that community. Local chambers of commerce, youth clubs, political organizations, and religious groups, among others, could sponsor and promote public forums on the issues of working while in school and could be the driving force in enlisting the participation of schools, students, parents, and employers in these activities and forging the linkages that are critical to the successful implementation of the strategies

cited above.

New Credits and Credentials for Working Youth

There is little disagreement that young people learn through work. The debate has been on what they learn and how what they learn on the job relates to and affects what is learned in school. There is a need to look more closely at what students learn through work and to create assessment measures for such learning. Skills and knowledge gained through non-school based work experience would be evaluated and credit awarded accordingly. One possibility is to use models of credit for life experience granted at the postsecondary level, such as the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) and the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL) program. Some variations on this theme might include:

- o cooperative and work-study programs based on the postsecondary models, including part of the day/week/month in school, the other part in the workplace;
- o internships or individual learning contracts negotiated between the student and his/her teachers which would combine experiential components from the workplace with reflective and theoretical studies, using two different cognitive processes: recording of reflections and observations related as closely as possible to the realities of work experience itself followed by analyses of the interrelationships among these, followed in turn by syntheses that suggest larger meanings and implications;
- o apprenticeships, like the West German system noted in Section VII, that recognize that for some students schools may not be the best settings for learning, particularly for the many students who do not go on to postsecondary education; and;
- o development of a companion credential to the academic transcript or report card which combines education with paid and unpaid work experiences, as well as family and community roles and responsibilities (e.g. the National Institute for Work and Learning's Career Passport which helps students: identify their paid and volunteer experiences in school, the community, and at home; translate these experiences into skills, knowledge, abilities, and competencies; and present this information, along with education and career plans, in a concise formal document).

Dissemination of Information on Student Work Experience

It is essential that the knowledge gained from the research that has been

done already and the research that has been proposed be made available, together with information on effective and creative programmatic approaches to student work experience, on as wide a basis as possible. A national clearinghouse on youth employment issues would be one channel for disseminating what we know about youth and work, but rather than create a new institution at the national level, with all the attendant bureaucratic problems and costs, it would be most feasible to make this information available through the already existing network of State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees (SOICCs). The SOICCs are established under Title IV of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 (P.L. 98-524). Each state receiving funds under the Act is required to establish a SOICC to implement an occupational information system which meets the common needs for planning and operating state programs and for implementing a state career information delivery system. Information related to student work experience would be a valuable addition to these state level data systems.

Policy Recommendation

The decline in the numbers of youth coupled with the increasing demand for their services in the workplace will affect the nature and patterns of youth employment. While the issues of youth and work are of paramount concern to educators and employers, federal and state governments should not stand idly by. They should not let the supply and demand for student time and services dictate policies and practices. A careful assessment of the costs and benefits of work experiences for students is needed as a base for new governmental policies or for the continuation of the current "hands-off" approach.

Our policy recommendation, therefore, calls for a Student Work Experience Experimentation and Demonstration Projects Act (SWEEDPA) that could be initiated at the federal or state level. The proposed legislative program would be modeled on the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (YEDPA), authorizing a range of research, evaluation, and demonstration activities aimed

at increasing our understanding of work experience while in school in order to determine the most effective policies and programs to enhance the benefits and eliminate the disadvantages of student work experience. Like the YEDPA projects, which focused on disadvantaged youth, projects funded under this Act would provide a wealth of information on what programs and strategies are effective for different subgroups of youth with differing needs. Such a comprehensive and wide-ranging program would allow for:

- o Implementation of new ideas and approaches in multiple sites with varying conditions and large samples necessary to capture the impacts of short-term interventions or to predict success in varied settings.
- o Focus on improving existing programs and practices, not just encouraging innovation.
- o Coordination of research, demonstration, and evaluation activity.
- o Dissemination and synthesis of the research, evaluation, and demonstration findings, enhancing the comparability and integration of studies and avoiding duplication of effort.
- o Application of findings through a planned process of replication, mechanisms for implementing improvements in conventional approaches, and direct impact on policymaking.

Much, if not all, of the research proposed in Section VII could be conducted under the Student Work Experience Experimentation and Demonstration Projects Act (SWEEDPA). In addition, virtually all of the programs proposed above could be supported under this Act.

In Conclusion

Given the large numbers of youth who are working and going to school simultaneously, it is apparent that youth work is here to stay. What matters now is moving away from the status quo and actively ensuring that work experience during school is beneficial to young people in terms of their educational, occupational, and personal development.

By implementing the recommendations and research proposed in this paper, we will be taking some of the actions necessary as a society to ensure that today's youth will become tomorrow's responsible and productive workers, family members, and citizens.

REFERENCES

Bachman, J.G.

1970 Youth in Transition: Vol. II. The Impact of Family Background and Intelligence on Tenth-Grade Boys. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research.

Bachman, J.G.

1983 Premature affluence: Do high school students earn too much? Economic Outlook U.S.A., 10(3): 64-67.

Bachman, J.G., O'Malley, P.M., & Johnson, J.

1978 Youth in Transition: Vol. VI. Adolescence to Adulthood-Change and Stability in the Lives of Young of Young Men. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research.

Barton, P., & Fraser, B.S.

1978 Between Two Worlds: Youth Transition from School to Work, Vol. 2: Programs and Experimentation, Center for Education and Work, National Manpower Institute, Washington, D.C.

Borman, K., & Breeburg, M.

1986 Training on the job. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Meeting, San Francisco, CA.

Borman, K., & Reisman, J. (eds.)

1986 Becoming a Worker. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Business Advisory Commission of the Education Commission of the States 1985 Reconnecting Youth: The Next Stage of Reform. Denver: Author.

Center for Human Resource Research

1976 National Longitudinal Surveys Handbook. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research.

Center for Human Resource Research

1984 The National Longitudinal Surveys Handbook. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.

Charner, I., & Fraser, B.S.

1984 Fast Food bs. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Work and Learning.

Cole, S.

1980 Working Kids on Working. New York: Lothrop, Lee & Shepard Books.

D'Amico, R.

1983 The nature and consequences of high school employment. Pp. 1-49 in M. Borus (ed.), Pathways to the Future, Volume IV. Columbus, OH: Center for Human Resource Research.

D'Amico, R.

1984 Does working in high school impair academic progress? Sociology of Education, 57: 157-164.

Farkas, G. et al.,/Abt Associates, Inc.

1984 Post-Program Impacts of the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Fetters, W.B.

1974 National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972. A Capsule Description of High School Seniors: Base-Year Survey. U.S.D.W., Office of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Fetters, W.B.

1976 National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972. Student Questionnaire and Test Results by Academic Ability, Socioeconomic Status, and Region. U.S.D.H.W. National Center for Education Statistics.

Finch, M.D. & Mortimer J.T.

1985 Adolescent work hours and the process of achievement. In Alan C. Kerckhoff (ed.), Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization 5:171-196. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Freeman, R.B., & Wise, D.A.

1979 Summary Report: Youth Unemployment. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Glass, G.

1976 Primary, secondary, and meta-analysis of research. Educational Researcher, 5: 3-8.

Glass G.

1978 Integrating findings: The meta-analysis of research. In L.S. Shulman (Ed.), Review of Research in Education (Vol. 5). Itasca, Ill.: F. Peacock.

Glass, G., McGaw, B., & Smith, M.L.

1981 Meta-analysis in Social Research. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Glenbard East Echo.

1984 Teenagers Themselves. New York: Adama Books.

Gottfredson, D.

1982 A test of a student-environment interaction hypothesis in a model of delinquency. Unpublished manuscript. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Gottfredson, D.

1985 Youth employment, crime, and schooling: A longitudinal study of a national sample. Developmental Psychology, Vol. 21, No. 3: 419-432.

Greater Portland Work-Education Council.

1981 Work Attitudes Survey: How Youth View & Value Work. Portland, OR: Author.

Greenberger, E. & Steinberg, L.D.

1981 Adolescents who work: Health & behavioral consequences of job stress. Developmental Psychology, Vol. 17, No. 6: 691-703.

Greenberger, E. & Steinberg, L.D.

1982 The workplace as a context for the socialization of youth. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 10: 185-210.

Greenberger, E. & Steinberg, L.D.

1986 When Teenagers Work: The Psychological and Social Costs of Adolescent Employment. New York: Basic Books.

Greenberger, E., Steinberg, L.D., & Ruggiero, M.

1982 A job is a job is a job... Or is it? Work and Occupations, Vol. 9, No. 1: 79-96.

Greenberger, E., Steinberg, L.D., & Vaux, A.

1981 Adolescents who work: Health and behavioral consequences of job stress. Developmental Psychology, 17: 691-703.

Greenberger, E., Steinberg, L.D., Vaux, A., & McAuliffe, S.

1980 Adolescents who work: Effects of part-time employment on family and peer relations. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, Vol. 9, No. 3: 189-202.

Hamilton, S.

1987 Apprenticeship as a transition to adulthood in West Germany. American Journal of Education, 92: 314-345.

Harvard Education Newsletter

1986 Teenagers who work: The lessons after-school employment. The Harvard Education Letter, II (5): 1-3.

Hill, R.B., & Nixon, R.

1984 Youth Employment in American Industry. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.

Holt J.

1980 Growing up engaged. Psychology Today (July): 14, 16, 23.

Hotchkiss, L.

1982 Effects of Work Time on School Activities and Career Expectations. (Tech. Rep.). Columbus, OH: National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Hotchkiss, L.

1986 Work and schools - complements or competitors? Pp. 90-115 in K. Borman and J. Reisman (eds.), Becoming a Worker. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Hotchkiss, L., & Chiteji, L.

1981 The Dynamics of Career Expectations of Youth: A Theoretical Formulation and Empirical Report Based on a Longitudinal Study. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Kohn, M.

1980 Job complexity and adult personality. Pp. 193-210 in N. Smelser and E. Erikson (eds.), Themes of Work and Love in Adulthood. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kohn M., & Scholler, C.

1978 The reciprocal effects of the substantive complexity of work and intellectual flexibility: a longitudinal assessment. American Journal of Sociology, 84: 24-52.

Kohn, M., & Scholler, C.

1982 Job conditions and personality: A Longitudinal assessment of their reciprocal effects. American Journal of Sociology, 87: 1257-1286.

Lacey, R.

1981 Making Youth Programs Work, Volume 1: Classrooms & Wkplaces. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Departments of Education and Labor.

Lewin-Epstein, N.

1981 Youth Employment during High School. An Analysis of High School and Beyond: A National Longitudinal Study for the 1980s. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

Lewis, M.V., Gardner, J.A., & Seitz, P.

1983 High School Work Experience and Its Effects. Columbus, OH: National Center for Research and Vocational Education.

McNeil, L.

1984 Lowering Expectations: The Impact of Student Employment on Classroom Knowledge. Madison: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Medrich, E., Roizen, J., Rubin, V., & Buckley, S.

1982 The Serious Business of Growing Up: A Study of Children's Lives Outside School. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Meyer, R.H., & Wise, D.

1979 The youth employment problem: Its dimensions, causes, and consequences. Pp. 1-28 in U.S. Department of Labor. Youth Knowledge Development Report 2.9. Research on Youth Development and Employability Development: The Youth Unemployment Problem-Dimensions, Causes and Consequences. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Michael, R.T., & Tuma, N.B.

1983 Youth employment: Does life begin at 16? Economics Research Center/NORC Discussion Paper 83-7.

Morgan, D.

1982 Teenagers and work: A mix that makes trouble. The Washington Post (October 17): B1-4.

Mortimer, J.T., & Finch, M.D.

1986 The effects of part-time work on adolescent self-concept and achievement. Pp. 66-89 in K. Borman & J. Reisman (eds.), Becoming a Worker. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Mortimer, J.T., & Borman, K. (eds.)

1986 Work Experience and Psychological Development Through the Life Span. American Association for the Advancement of Science Selected Symposium Series. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education

1973 The Reform of Secondary Education: A Report to the Public and the Profession. New York: McGraw-Hill.

National Commission on Youth

1980 The Transition of Youth to Adulthood: A Bridge Too Long. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

National Panel on High School and Adolescent Education

1976 The Education of Adolescents. The Final Report and Recommendations of the National Panel on High Schools and Adolescent Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Retail Merchants Association

1986 Assessment of labor shortages in retailing. New York: Author.

Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President

1973 Youth: Transition to Adulthood. Report of the Panel on Youth office President's Science Advisory Committee, Washington, D.C., U.S. GPO.

Ornati, O.

1986 A review of demographic developments and labor forecasts in retailing through 1995. New York: National Retail Merchants Association

Osterman, P.

1980 Getting Started. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee

1973 Youth: Transition to Adulthood. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Peng, S.S., Feters, W.B., & Kolstad, A.J.

1981 High School and Beyond: A National Longitudinal Study of the 1980's. A Capsule Description of High School Students. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Postman, N.

1982 The Disappearance of Childhood. New York: Delacorte Press.

Princeton Manpower Symposium

1968 The Transition from School to Work. A Report Based on the Princeton Manpower Symposium, May 9-10, 1968. Princeton, NJ: Industrial Relations Section, Princeton University.

Schill, W.J., McCartin, R., & Meyer, K.

1985 Youth employment: Its relationship to academic and family variables. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 26: 155-163.

Sewell, W.H., & Hauser, R.M.

1976 Causes and consequences of higher education: Models of the status attainment process. Pp. 9-27 in W.H. Sewell, R.M. Hauser, & D.L. Featherman (eds.), Schooling and Achievement in American Society. New York: Academic Press.

Shannon, L.W.

1982 Assessing the Relationship of Adult Criminal Careers to Juvenile Careers. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Snedeker, B.

1982 Hard Knocks: Preparing Youth for Work. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Steinberg, L.D.

1982 Jumping off the work experience bandwagon. Journal of Youth & Adolescence, Vol. III, No. 3: 183-205.

Steinberg, L.D., Greenberger, E., Garduque, L., & McAuliffe, S.

1982 High school students in the labor force: Some costs and benefits to schooling and learning. Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 4: 363-372.

Stephenson, S.P., Jr.

1979 The short-run employment consequences of work experience while in school. Expanding Employment Opportunities for Disadvantaged Youth. Washington D.C.: National Commission for Employment Policy.

Stevenson, W.

1978a The transition from school to work. In Adams, A.V., and Mangum, G.L., with Stevenson W., Doniger, S. & Mangum, S., The Lingering Crisis of Youth Unemployment, Kalamazoo, MI: W. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Stevenson, W.

1978b The relationship between early work experience and future employability. In Adams, A.V., and Mangum, G.L., with Stevenson, W., Doniger, S.F. and Mangum, S., The Lingering Crisis of Youth Unemployment. Kalamazoo, MI: W. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Temme, L.V.

1975 Occupation: Meanings & Measures. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Science Research.

The President's Task Force on Youth Employment

1980 A Review of Youth Employment Problems, Programs & Policies. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.

U.S. Department of Labor. Youth Knowledge Development Report Series. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wirtz, W.W.

1975 The Boundless Resource: A Prospectus for an Education/Work Policy. Washington, D.C.: New Republic Book Co.

APPENDIX

MAJOR DATA SOURCES ON YOUTH AND WORK

1. National Longitudinal Surveys (NLS)

These surveys were conducted by the Center for Human Resource Research, Ohio State University for the U.S. Department of Labor. The NLS surveys constitute a 10-year longitudinal study of the labor market experiences of four subsets of the U.S. population: men 45-59 years of age; women 30-44 years of age; young men 14-24 years of age; and young women 14-24 years of age. For each cohort a national sample of approximately 5,000 was surveyed. The data on the young men were originally collected in 1966 and on the young women in 1968.

Measures of employment: 1) employed last week; 2) number of hours worked last week; 3) hourly wages; 4) employer; 5) type of work; 6) industry.

Reference: Center for Human Resource Research, 1976.

2. Youth in Transition (YIT)

This study was conducted by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research. Over 2,000 tenth grade boys from 87 high schools across the United States were initially surveyed in 1966. Follow-up surveys were undertaken in 1968, 1969, and 1974.

Measures of employment: 1) current employment status.

Reference: Bachman et al., 1978.

3. National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972 (NLS-72)

This survey was conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Over 1,000 public and nonpublic schools and almost 18,000 high school seniors participated in the base-year survey conducted in 1972. Follow-ups of the original sample have been undertaken periodically.

Measures of employment: 1) average number of hours worked per week over the school year in a paid or unpaid job; 2) when mostly work (weekends or during the week).

Reference: Fetters, 1974

4. Monitoring the Future (MTF)

This study was conducted by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research. Surveys have been conducted in the Spring of each year starting in 1975. Each data collection takes place in approximately 125 public and private schools from across the United States. Up to 400 seniors in each school are selected to participate in the study.

Measures of employment: 1) average number of hours worked per week over the school year in a paid or unpaid job; 2) weekly earnings.

Reference: Bachman et al., 1980.

5. Study of Significant Others' Influence (SOI)

This study was conducted by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University. Three waves of data were collected from a sample of 714 youth attending public high schools in Columbus, Ohio. The first wave was collected during the sophomore year (1978-79 school year), with subsequent waves collected during the fall of respondents' junior and senior years in high school. Almost 600 youth completed all three waves.

Measures of employment: 1) name and duties of each job held; 2) name of place of business; 3) starting and ending dates; 4) number of hours worked per week; 5) hourly wage; 6) Duncan Socioeconomic Index of jobs.

Reference: Hotchkiss and Chiteji, 1981.

6. Orange County (CA) Study of Employment and Family Background (OCS)

This study was undertaken by the University of California, Irvine. Tenth and 11th grade students from four high schools in Orange County, CA participated in the study. Of the 3,100 students in the original 1978 sample, 1,000 were selected for more intensive study. A subsample of this group was drawn consisting of all teenagers who were currently holding their first part-time job or who were currently working and had held only one past job during the summer, and a random sample of teenagers who had never worked. The final subsample consisted of 531 students.

Measures of employment: 1) paid employment of at least three hours per week; 2) hours of work.

Reference: Greenberger and Steinberg, 1986.

7. National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Market Experience of Youth (DOL-NLS)

This survey was conducted by the Center for Human Resource Research, Ohio State University for the U.S. Department of Labor. The survey was administered to a nationally representative sample of 12,000 respondents aged 14-21 in 1979. Respondents were reinterviewed annually to the present. Over 5,000 of the original respondents were enrolled in grades 9-12 in 1979. Extensive work histories are collected each year of the survey for all jobs held within the previous year.

Measures of employment: 1) number of weeks employed per grade/year; 2) usual hours worked per week; 3) types of jobs; 4) hours worked; 5) wages; 6) duration.

Reference: Center for Human Resource Research, 1984.

8. High School and Beyond: A National Longitudinal Study of the 1980's (HSB)

This survey was conducted by the National Opinion Research Center for the Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. A total of 58,728 students (sophomores and seniors) from 1,016 high schools participated in the first wave (1980) of this longitudinal study. Follow-ups of the original sample have been undertaken and additional ones are planned.

Measures of employment: 1) work for pay last week, not counting work around the house; 2) hours worked per week; 3) hourly wages; 4) types of jobs.

Reference: Peng et al., 1981.

9. School Action Effectiveness Study (SAES)

This study was conducted as part of the national evaluation of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency's Alternative Education Initiative. Sixty-nine schools in 17 cities participated in the project. A survey of the students in the schools was conducted in the spring of 1981 with a follow-up one year later. Two hundred students were randomly selected from each school to participate in the study. In all, 11,130 students in grades 6 through 12 completed the SAES in 1981 and 4,311 in 1982.

Measure of employment: currently holding a job in 1981, 1982, or both years.

Reference: Gottfredson, 1985.

10. National Study of Employment in the Fast Food Industry (FFI)

This study was conducted by the National Institute for Work and Learning. Hourly employees on the May or June 1982 payrolls of 279 fast food restaurants from seven companies were surveyed as part of this study. Of the eligible sample of 7,021, 66% returned questionnaires. Fifty-nine percent of the sample were 14-18 years old.

Measures of employment: 1) average hours worked per week; 2) number of months employed; 3) hourly wages; 4) current fast food employment status; 5) job duties.

Reference: Charner and Fraser, 1984.

11. State of Washington Study of High School Students (SWS)

This study was conducted by the University of Washington. The sample consisted of 4,587 students from public and private schools in the State of Washington. The students ranged in age from 14 to 19 years and included 270 freshmen, 660 sophomores, 1,438 juniors, and 2,178 seniors. Data were collected in the middle of the week in May 1983.

Measures of employment: 1) employed or not employed; 2) number of hours employed per week; 3) Duncan Socioeconomic Index of present job.

Reference: Schill et al., 1985.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

IVAN CHARNER is Director of Research and Development at the National Institute for Work and Learning in Washington, D.C. His responsibilities include the design, development, and direction of projects and programs dealing with educational policies and practices; career planning and development; youth transition; adult learning; and human resource development. He has worked with schools, local education agencies, state departments of education, postsecondary education institutions, corporations, unions, government agencies and community based organizations to improve education, training, teaching and career-related programs and services.

Mr. Charner has served as a consultant to the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, National Alliance of Business, and numerous school districts and corporations. He is on the Board of Directors of the Manpower Analysis and Planning Society and is Chair of the research committee of the American Society for Training and Development.

Mr. Charner has written extensively on youth development, human resource development, adult learning, and education and training.

BRYNA SHORE FRASER is a Senior Program Officer at the National Institute for Work and Learning. She is the director of the National Study of Employment in the Fast Food Industry and the editor of the "Postsecondary Education for a Changing Economy Series" and has done extensive research on employment-related education and training issues for youth and adults during her thirteen years at the Institute.

Ms. Fraser has served as a consultant to the National Academy of Sciences, U.S. Department of Labor's Women's Bureau, National Commission for Employment Policy, U.S. Department of Education, and the University of Tennessee's Office for Research in High Technology Education. She has also made numerous presentations to corporate and government groups interested in transitions between education and employment.

Ms. Fraser has written widely on the impact of new technologies in the workplace, the youth transition from school to work, and the integration of work and education for adults.

THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR WORK AND LEARNING (NIWL), a private, tax exempt, not-for-profit corporation, seeks to improve the relationships between institutions of work and of learning; to facilitate linkages between education and work for youth and adults; and to bring the supply of and demand for critical skills into better balance. The means to these ends have taken a variety of forms, including: research, pilot programs, case studies, policy studies, information networking, and technical assistance.

A common thread runs through all NIWL undertakings: the pursuit of collaborative efforts among employers, educators, unions, service organizations, and government to resolve work and learning problems. The development of collaborative processes at local, state, and national levels has been a consistent focus of the Institute since its creation in 1971.

A COMMENTARY

on Ivan Charner and Bryna Shore Fraser's

YOUTH AND WORK: WHAT WE KNOW; WHAT WE DON'T KNOW; WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW;

by Sue E. Berryman

I have positive and negative reactions to the Charner and Fraser paper, entitled Youth and Work: What We Know, What We Don't Know, and What We Need to Know. On the positive side, the paper does a reasonable job of identifying the literature relevant to questions about youth and work. It solidly and clearly summarizes the literature's data and research results around a useful set of organizing issues. Its research recommendations (Chapter VII) are generally cogent and flow quite convincingly from problems that the authors have identified in the previous chapters.

On the negative side, I have three comments. First, the literature review is more a descriptive summary than an analytic synthesis. Chapters II, III, IV, and V are intended to "map" what we know about various dimensions of youth and work. However, these chapters verge on data in search of interpretative frameworks or fundamental questions. Although the paper has interpretive comments, these are scattered throughout the paper, and the authors make no decision about their relative importance.

For example, Chapter IV summarizes the data on student work experiences. However, the authors provide no compelling framework by which to give meaning to or to stimulate important questions about undeniably adequately described characteristics of these experiences. What is the reader to make of these data? Why is it important to know them? What difference does it make that the numbers come out one way rather than another?

Second, the literature on the effects of student participation in work, summarized in Chapter VI, cries out for a much tougher methodological critique

than it now receives. Chapter VI focuses primarily on causal, as opposed to descriptive or "mapping," questions. This chapter deals with potentially dangerous and mischievous material, since beliefs about cause and effect get used to define social problems and to design policy solutions.

The literature described in this chapter seems fraught with the self-selection bias problem.¹ The authors are clearly aware of this problem,² but it should infuse their presentation of the material in Chapter VI much more than it does. The authors miss several chances to point out plausible and significant alternative interpretations of important findings in this literature.

Finally, the authors' policy recommendations in Chapter VIII seem like solutions in search of a problem. They state on page 65 that *"We cannot simply wait to take action until we have more information. We need to move forward on a parallel course of program and policy initiatives."* However: action why? What is the problem -- or the opportunity? The earlier chapters document data and analysis holes, and the authors' research recommendations build on and connect to these earlier chapters. They are accordingly quite convincing. However, these early chapters do not build a case about youth and work that provides any basis for policy action, public or private. If anything, they do the opposite. They convince the reader that we have no compelling basis for deciding if student working poses either problem or opportunity and in what ways.

¹ For example, D'Amico (1984) found no adverse effects on class rank for any race or gender group of students who worked, regardless of the number of hours worked per week. He concludes that work "may actually foster behaviors or traits in students that promote academic success" (p. 153). However, we do not know if D'Amico's finding is attributable to characteristics that promote both performing well in school and working that do not generalize beyond this group.

² For example, the issue is nicely discussed in connection with the Gottfredson analysis of the relationship between working during school and delinquency. Gottfredson (1982; 1985) found that a presumed positive relationship between delinquency and working during school disappeared when earlier delinquency and other predictors of delinquency were statistically controlled.

I know that the Commission asked the authors to proffer policy recommendations, and they make a nice case for the public utility of more information about student working (pp.66-70). However, this recommendation is exactly one that requires more information about student working before it can be implemented.

The idea of credits and credentials for working youth is certainly worth hanging onto. However, it would seem to require knowing more than, by the authors' own admission, we now know about the learning opportunities that youth jobs present. This idea should also be informed by the frontier work in cognitive psychology about practical learning and the possible limits to conventional concepts of apprenticeships (see below).

The idea about adding information on student work experience to the state level data systems presumes that the SOICCs are effective planning and information delivery systems. Existing data challenge this assumption.

The authors propose a Student Work Experience Experimentation and Demonstration Projects Act. This would consist of "a range of research, evaluation, and demonstration activities aimed at increasing our understanding of work experience while in school in order to determine the most effective policies and programs to enhance the benefits and eliminate the disadvantages of student work experience" (p.72). As a research engine, this idea strikes me as a much more expensive and cumbersome way to build a knowledge base than the ideas proposed in Chapter VII. As a way of testing policy, its action components seem premature. Again, the authors have built no convincing sense of problem or opportunity which might represent the rationale for action.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT YOUTH AND WORK

Let me highlight, extend, or add to points that Charner and Fraser make about youth and work. In general, these comments follow the organization of the paper.

Chapter I

Charner and Fraser are absolutely right to challenge two images or assumptions that dominate our thinking about youth and work and that are either questionable or bankrupt. One is the image of youth's transition from school to work. Most of us know the rough outlines of student labor force participation. However, we have not gone the next step: (1) to rearrange our implicit images of youth activity patterns during high school; and (2) to think through the implications of these patterns for how we construe in-school and post-high school youth development and behavior.

For example, Charner and Fraser (p.4) cite the report of the National Panel on High School and Adolescent Education, a report that sounded themes similar to those of earlier reports, such as the Coleman Panel on Youth for the President's Science Advisory Committee (PSAC).

...only in the last 25 years has the majority of teenagers, through school attendance, been increasingly separated from significant contact with older adults, other than parents and teachers. The successful achievement of a high school experience has been accompanied by...delayed entry into the real adult world...[and] delay in the early transmission of adult culture patterns....(1976, pp.4-5)

The statistics on youth labor force participation call into question views such as these--and reveal the usual policy "solution" associated with them (kids should work more) as a little silly. (Kids are already working a lot.)

Second, Charner and Fraser refreshingly challenge the assumption that student working is necessarily "good" for the student and society. The paper's literature review attests to the complexities of relationships between student working and individual and social outcomes.

Chapters II and III

The fact of a secular trend in student labor force participation (Chapter II) contains its own key question. Why is this secular trend occurring? This question is analogous to demographic questions about cycles in childbearing rates or secular trends in women's labor force participation. As in these cases, it is answered, not by understanding why individual youth choose to work (the issue of Chapter III), but by understanding how the context for work choices has become redefined by the confluence of other social trends.³ From this perspective, the question about increased student labor force participation becomes a "window" on what are probably multiple changes in the cultural and institutional context for youth. Understanding this redefined "ground" helps us understand, not only the dynamics that underlie decisions to work, but also other choices that affect and are affected by work choices.

Charner and Fraser allude to possible explanations for this change (p.16). Obviously, there are economic preconditions here. However, more interesting are possible changes in schools, families, and cultural values that have combined to make work more attractive.

School. Potentially important factors here are free time and changes in the composition of the high school student body. The average American high school experience leaves students substantial out-of-school free time. We have only to look at the demands that tough American high schools or that high schools in other countries, such as Japan, make on their students to appreciate how much time the average high school leaves its students.

Another factor might be changes in the composition of the high school. Positive trends in high school completion could mean a high school student body

³ There are several excellent analyses of this kind -- for example, Easterlin's work on changes in birth rates as a function of changes in cohort sizes; Watkins, Meken, and Bongaantz's work on the demographic foundations of family change; or Cogan's work on the relationship between increasing black male unemployment rates and the changing economic structure of the South.

that consists of a larger percent who in earlier decades would have left school to go to work. This group should be more susceptible to what, according to Charner and Fraser, the Germans call "school weariness." In the United States "school weary" probably translates into what we call "at-risk."

By at-risk youth I mean those who do not perform well in traditional schools, either because they are not very good at standard academic subjects or -- and this is an exceedingly important "or" -- because they do not want to be good at or see the point of being good at them. These youth, as they age, coast or scrape by to graduation, or drop out of school. (It is important to note that although at-risk children come disproportionately from poor families, all families either have a child of this sort or friends with a child of this sort.)

I suggest that the process by which school weariness emerges has to do with the student's vision of his or her place in the adult world. All children develop an image of their future niche in this world -- in the ecological sense of niche. Their ideas about the ecology of adult "places" may be distorted and are usually pitifully and pathetically partial. However, they seem to work out notions of their basic futures and of the trajectories relevant to them, even if they cannot state these explicitly. And they act on these ideas -- for example, electing into or out of advanced mathematics, depending on their sense of occupational destination.

Schools tend to concentrate on verbal and mathematical-logical skills; as Howard Gardner stated in a New York Times article, *"We subject everyone to an education where, if you succeed, you will be best suited to a college professor."* (November 9, 1986; p.23) Although verbal and mathematical-logical skills are clearly important, by concentrating on them, schools may unintentionally lose the student who does not anticipate participating in highly academic activities as an adult. The "losing" can range from actual dropping out of high school to

spending time during school in activities that connect better with the student's sense of destination -- work and not particularly "academic" work.

Family. The big news here is that, increasingly, no one is at home. If students have free time and no adult is at home, we might expect students to look for somewhere outside of the home to go. Jobs and the workplace become one option.

Cultural values. Students get their values from what adults do and seem to want. Although thousands of fatuous words have been written about rampant post-World War II American materialism and greed, there is some truth in these words. The increase in student working in part probably reflects student absorption of these cultural values, work being one instrumentality for pursuing them.

Chapter III focuses on the reasons for and attitudes toward participation in work. For me the key issue here is the dynamics that underlie individual decisions to work or not to work. In other words, all youth are subject to changes in the context for work choices (see above). However, what explains why one student chooses to work and another chooses not to?

Much of the literature that Charner and Fraser found on this question relies on surveys that ask students why they work. Although on the surface this sounds sensible, my experience with similar questions (e.g., why youth enlist in the military) is that they yield a superficial understanding of these choices. Respondents give good answers to questions if, not only they are willing to answer them, but can answer them. My research experience suggests that youth often do not understand the patterns of their own lives and how particular choices relate to these patterns.

For example, I analyzed data from a national longitudinal survey of youth, concentrating on the 14 to 17 year-olds in the sample. The purpose was to understand the dynamics that underlie the traditionality of young girls'

occupational choices. What drove these girls' occupational choices were fundamental choices about what kinds of commitments they expected to make as adults. The adult agendas that these girls had for themselves revolved around the basic issue of family versus work. Their commitment to one or the other (or to some balance between them) drove the traditionality of their occupational choices, which in turn drove the future educational investments that they expected to make.

I doubt that these girls understood that many of their future plans and current choices simply cascaded from and elaborated a fundamental choice of direction. In other words, in response to direct questions, I doubt that these girls could have cogently described the structure of choices that lay so clearly in the data.

Chapters IV, V, and VI

What interests me the most about these chapters is what might be described as "lessons" of the workplace. What do student workers learn from their jobs and from whom do they learn it? I want to know the source of learning for several reasons, but partly to see if the places where students work are age-integrated. Do students work in places with some age diversity, or in ones peopled only with younger and older adolescents? In other words, does working give students access to adults other than parents and teachers, or is this a myth?

Four learning dimensions interest me. First, what do they learn about what is legal, versus ethical, versus permissible behavior in the workplace? From whom and how do they draw conclusions about these issues? Answers here should inform our thinking about relationships between levels and types of delinquency and working.

Second, what major skills do they pick up from their jobs, and how do they acquire them? Charner and Fraser make good points here about the limits to occupational codes -- and other categorizing schemes -- for inferring skill

requirements or skill acquisition. I think we should be less interested in occupationally-specific skills than important cross-occupational ones. Getting some agreement on what these should be is undeniably tough. (See below for more comment on this problem.)

Third, what workplace behaviors do they acquire, and from whom? These are the non-cognitive lessons of working, such as showing up on time, and they are not necessarily "good" lessons. For example, students may learn to do what they are told, even if it is inefficient.

Fourth, what conclusions do students draw from work experiences that affect their educational, occupational, marital, and childbearing choices? As Charner and Fraser rightly point out, we dismiss student jobs as "low skill," "deadend," "non-career," "casual," and "low commitment. However, each job is a learning experience -- sometimes quite a negative one, but a learning experience nonetheless. What do students make of these experiences, and how do they integrate them into their views of and plans for their futures?

Another issue that Chapter VI discusses that seems especially important to me is the relationship between student working, student earning, and parental authority. Studies show that working has given women some economic independence of men and reduced the control that men exert over choices made within the marriage. However, parent-child relationships differ from spousal ones, and the effects of student working on parental authority may depend more on the agreement that parents and child have about working. Who controls the money that students earn?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

My final comment relates only tangentially to Youth and Work. Charner and Fraser talk about schools using student working to relate "education to work and work to education without lowering their standards and expectations." I think a major question about youth and work is really a question about work and schools.

The answers here should profoundly affect all youth. However, they would probably most affect our chances of integrating students who do not operate comfortably in a symbolic world into school.

My thoughts here challenge distinctions between work-related and "general" learning, between a vocational and an academic high school education, and between school-based and work-based learning processes.

This challenge emerges out of path-breaking work being conducted in cognitive psychology, some at the National Center on Education and Employment at Teachers College, Columbia University by Sylvia Scribner. Lauren Resnick, a colleague of Scribner's, compellingly summarized this challenge in her Presidential Address at the American Educational Research Association's meeting in Washington, D.C., this April. She delineates four broad contrasts between in-school and out-of-school mental activity. This set of contrasts raises profound questions about the utility and effectiveness of schooling for all non-school activity, including work of all types, and for all learners, whether at-risk or not-at-risk.

The first contrast is between individual cognition in school versus shared cognition outside. For the most part, school is designed so that one student's success or failure at a task is independent of what other students do (aside from grading on a curve). By contrast, a great deal of activity outside of school is socially shared: work, personal life, and recreation take place in social systems in which what one person is able to do depends fundamentally on what others do and in which "successful" functioning depends upon the mesh of several individuals' mental and physical performances.

The knowledge necessary to perform most tasks is distributed through a work group. Furthermore, an important aspect of knowledge is built into the tools used. Thus, there is a further sharing of knowledge with tools and builders of tools, who are not present during the performance of a task, but who are part of

the total knowledge system required for successful performance.

The second contrast is between pure mentation in school versus tool manipulation. In school, the greatest premium is placed on "pure thought" activities -- what individuals can do without dependence on "external crutches" -- whether books and notes, calculators, or other complex instruments. While some of these tools may be used, even encouraged, during "learning," they are almost always absent during tests of performance. Thus, school becomes an institution that values thought that is independent of the physical and cognitive tools that are a vital and defining part of virtually all practical activity. Out of school, by contrast, most mental activities are intimately involved with and shaped by the physical and intellectual tools available. Tool use is not only a way for people of limited education to participate in cognitively complex activity systems. It is also a way of enhancing capacity for highly educated people well beyond what they could do independently.

The third contrast is between symbol manipulation in school versus reasoning about things and situations that make sense to people outside of school. School learning is mostly symbol-based, to such an extent that connections to the things being symbolized are often lost. Outside of school, actions are intimately connected with things and events. Quoting Scribner's work, Resnick notes that men taking inventory in a dairy warehouse use the physical environment as part of their arithmetic calculations. They know exactly how many cases will fill a given space, and subtract from this number the number of cases that they can visually see to be missing from the "cube" that would be formed if the space were completely filled. Thus, these men do less work that is recognizably arithmetic than we might have expected, but they are getting reliable arithmetical results. They are doing this by treating the stuff of the world as part of their calculation process, rather than just operating on numbers.

Out of school, because one is engaged with things and situations that make

sense to people, people do not fall into the trap of forgetting what their calculations or their reasoning is about. Their mental activities make sense in terms of their immediate effects, and their actions are grounded in the logic of immediate situations. In school, however, there is a very large tendency for symbolic activities to become detached from any meaningful context. School learning then becomes a matter of learning rules and saying or writing things according to the rules. This focus on symbols detached from their referents can create difficulties even for school learning itself. For example, it can lead to systematic and persistent errors of a kind that seem virtually absent in practical arithmetic.

In other words, the process of schooling seems to encourage the idea that the "game of school" is to learn symbolic rules of various kinds, and that there is not supposed to be much relationship between what one knows outside of school and learning in school. The evidence is growing that not only may schooling not contribute in a direct and obvious way to performances outside of school, but knowledge acquired outside of school is not always used to support in-school learning. Schooling is coming to look more and more isolated from the rest of what we do.

The fourth contrast is between generalized learning in school versus situation-specific competencies outside. In school we aim for general, widely useable skill and theoretical principles. Indeed, the major claim for school-type instruction is, usually, its generality and its power of transfer. Yet outside, to be truly skillful, people must develop situation-specific forms of competence. The "packages" of knowledge and skill that schools provide seem unlikely to map directly onto the clusters of knowledge they will actually use in their work. This seems true even for highly technical knowledge, where "schooling" is intended to provide direct professional training. Studies of expert radiologists, electronic trouble-shooters, and lawyers all reveal a

surprising lack of transfer of theoretical principles, processes, or skills learned in school to professional practice. All of this points toward the possibility that very little can be transported directly from school to out-of-school use. Both the structure of the knowledge used and the social structure of its use may be more fundamentally mismatched than we had previously thought. (Lauren Resnick, Learning in School and Out, Presidential Address, American Educational Research Association, April 22, 1987.)

At the same time, Resnick makes a telling point consistent with the results of many human capital studies in economics. Situation specific learning by itself is very limiting. Studies have shown that when the situation is changed from the familiar -- for example, by asking Brazilian bookies to accept unusual bets that cannot be constructed from their tables (Carrahers and Schliemann) -- unschooled individuals have a great deal of difficulty and may fail entirely. Schooled people do better, although -- and this is an important point -- they rarely use the supposedly general algorithms that they have been taught in school and instead invent new solutions specifically appropriate to the situation at hand.

A central problem for the American economy is the ability of workers to deal with discontinuity -- the need for "adaptability" or "flexibility." A central question for youth, schools, and the economy is what it is about more education that helps produce this ability to adapt in the face of transitions and breakdowns. We can surmise that more education provides students with an overview or broad understanding of what they are doing. However, we do not know whether this is the case, how individuals draw on greater schooling to deal with discontinuity, or what are the most effective ways to create the ability to deal with breakdown and transition. To make progress here, we need to understand more than we do now about how to use school to promote skills for learning in practical settings. As Resnick notes, we badly need studies, not just of experts in various fields, but of people in the course of becoming experts.

DR. SUE E. BERRYMAN directs the National Center on Education and Employment and its institutional home, the Institute on Education and the Economy at Teachers College, Columbia University. She also holds an Adjunct Professorship in the Division of Philosophy, the Social Sciences, and Education at Teachers College.

For twelve years prior to assuming the Center directorship, Dr. Berryman was a Behavioral Scientist with the RAND Corporation in their Santa Monica and Washington, D.C., offices. Her research has focused on the dynamics that underlie individuals' educational and employment choices and the nature and public consequences of organizational human resource policies.

Although she was formally trained in experimental design, Dr. Berryman has used a variety of methods in her policy analysis work. These methods include estimating simultaneous equation models from survey data, such as data from The National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972, The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth Labor Market Behavior, High School and Beyond, and special Defense Department military personnel data bases; qualitative analyses of historical data, such as data on the social composition of the nation's enlisted force in the nineteenth century; qualitative analyses of elites, such as interviews with corporate human resource vice-presidents about their demand for foreign language and international study skills; and syntheses of national statistics and the results of completed studies for policy analysis purposes.

Her major publications for the last two years include studies for the Rockefeller Foundation, the Graduate Management Admission Council, the National Commission for Employment Policy, and the Ford Foundation. She has just published a book on the nineteenth and twentieth century social composition of the enlisted forces that reveals patterned discrepancies between who served and public images of who served.

A COMMENTARY

on Ivan Charner and Bryna Shore Fraser's

YOUTH AND WORK: WHAT WE KNOW; WHAT WE DON'T KNOW; WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW

by Hayes Mizell

Despite current concerns about greed on Wall Street, low labor productivity, and the erosion of the agricultural and industrial sectors of the nation's economy, our society's commitment to the value of work remains strong. Hard work, and its promised reward, is part of our national mythology and a prescription for national recovery and personal success. People who don't work, or can't work, are scorned or pitied. Many people become so identified with their work that they need therapy to help them develop more balanced, healthy lives. Indeed, the compulsion to work is so strong that when people retire from their full-time, income-producing occupations many of them keep on working, albeit in a part-time, volunteer, or recreational context.

It is to be expected, therefore, that the majority of our nation's school-age youth seek work as soon as they are able. The Ivan Charner and Bryna Shore Fraser paper provides an excellent review of the research on why young people work, and the effects of their work on their educational achievement, futures, families, and friends.

Unfortunately, Charner-Fraser were not asked to look at either (1) the number of in-school youth who want or need the benefits work is thought to provide, or (2) the number of in-school youth who want or need to work to secure these benefits but who cannot find jobs. Their exclusive focus on the conditions of employed youth results in an implication that a potential "dark side" to the youth-work experience necessitates additional research. The possible negatives of school-age youth working appear to be that they may not understand how their work will affect other areas of their lives, they may be led into delinquency,

they may become materialistic, or they may jeopardize their futures.

Any of these consequences of working are certainly possible, more so for some subpopulations more than others, but they are also true for adults in the workplace. However, there seems to be little empirical or anecdotal evidence to suggest that these problems are so unique or pervasive that they merit major attention and resources.

Apparently, most school-age employees are not being exploited, abused or otherwise harmed. Some students may suffer from work abuse but in contrast to the early years of this century it is largely self-inflicted. The Orange County, California study that revealed certain negative consequences of work for in-school youth should not be generally applied to the work experiences of most young people. The work experiences and culture of youth in Orange County, a metropolitan area with the nation's tenth largest number of households having an effective buying income of over \$50,000, are hardly representative of the nation's in-school labor force.

Early work experiences, like grades and social relationships, inevitably leave their mark but, thankfully, they are not necessarily predictive of a young person's future. Students' age and lack of experience may actually enable them to survive work-related problems more easily than if they were adults. An employer may be more tolerant of youthful mistakes than would be the case if these same errors were made by an adult worker in a more responsible, highly paid position. Police, judges, and social workers may be more understanding of the working delinquent than the youthful offender whose sole source of income is criminal activity.

School-age workers may have their problems but they pale in comparison to not being able to find a job, or to adult workers' concerns about day-care arrangements, the impact of payroll deductions on take-home pay, the potential for layoffs or arbitrary dismissal, the relation between wages and inflation,

and the adequacy of wages for decent shelter, clothing, food, and medical care. In fact, it can be argued that the sooner students are exposed to workplace environment in which these concerns can be observed and understood, the sooner they will be able to make more informed choices about their own futures as workers.

Young people work because, as the detective novels say, they have the "motive, means, and opportunity." As Charner-Fraser point out, students have the means primarily because of the tremendous growth in the service sector of the economy, and because there are jobs, particularly in the fast food industry, which are virtually designed for young people entering the labor market for the first time. These jobs require limited skills, provide close supervision, low wages, and occur in a setting in which there are social benefits because many co-workers and customers are from the employees' peer group.

Students have the opportunity to work simply because their families and communities impose few other demands on them, and may provide few other opportunities for them to obtain the rewards that work provides. Increasing involvement in activities outside the home is one way older adolescents separate themselves from their families and develop their own identities. Nothing is more maddening to parents or to the community than inactive youth who are merely "hanging out." Many of these students would not otherwise be supervised after school, and it is doubtful they would be devoting long hours to their studies. For this reason, many parents and community officials prefer students to be working. At work they are not only under supervision but they are learning skills, and they are earning money which they will quickly spend at the stores of local merchants. And it has been the experience of most adults that work is stabilizing, rather than a destabilizing, factor in life and for that reason too adults encourage in-school youth to work. The Charner-Fraser paper does not indicate there is research on this issue of how and to what extent families and

communities are psychologically and financially invested in school-age youth working.

As Charner-Fraser point out in the section on "Reasons For and Attitudes Towards Participation in Work Activities" more attention needs to be given to why students work. Understanding more about what motivates students to work can provide us with important insights into the needs of young people and lead us to analyze how well institutions other than the workplace meet those needs.

For example, most students say they work to earn spending money. But what does this really mean? In our market-driven economic system consumers have power. Major industries in our economy are dependent on the youth market. The motion picture and recording industries are two notable examples where corporations create and market products specifically designed to appeal to youthful consumers. Advertisements directed at the youth market implicitly communicate three important messages: (1) "Your opinion is so important that we have spent millions of dollars packaging and bringing to you this information about our product"; (2) "You have the power to purchase our product because you have the money to buy it"; and (3) "You can make an independent, free choice as to whether or not you want to purchase our product."

These messages acknowledge and affirm what so many in-school youth are trying to get their parents, their schools, and their communities to understand: They have opinions they believe are important. They have power they are trying to learn how to use. And they want to be able to make independent choices about things that are important to them. Earning money enables young people to interact with the economic system that reaches out to them, and appears to support them, in a way that other institutions do not.

Students may also work because the workplace helps them learn what other institutions do not succeed in teaching them. At home and school they are often told to "be responsible" and to "accept responsibility." But in most cases

young people take this to mean "Do what I say." Aside from this issue being complicated by the emotional dynamics of parent-child or teacher-student relationships, adults frequently communicate their lack of trust and confidence in young people. This is why students are seldom given meaningful responsibility. If they are given responsibility it usually takes only one mistake for them to be labeled as "irresponsible" and to have the responsibility taken away. In any case, youth may be unclear as to how they will benefit from accepting responsibility.

At work, however, the student quickly learns that responsibility means ownership for carrying out a specific task that otherwise will not get done. There is usually one person, and perhaps more, trained to direct, guide, and support the youth. Since it is a task that other people in the workplace either have done, or are doing, there is an assumption that certain mistakes may be made as the young person becomes responsible for the task. The choice is clear: accept responsibility for your work, or lose the job. In this environment most students learn how to accept responsibility and in later years, if not then, they readily express their appreciation for this opportunity.

Students may be motivated to work because for many of them secondary schools are boring institutions that continue to teach them and treat them as though they were in middle school. If students have mastered basic literacy and computational skills by the time they reach high school, they may remain in school only because they recognize the value of a diploma, and because of the social benefits of being where their friends are. But work provides high school students with an opportunity to be treated more like adults and to interact with adults on more of a peer level.

Work may also satisfy young people's need to be involved in an activity that enables them simultaneously to exercise control, make a contribution, gain recognition, and learn new skills. For students who are not academically

successful, and who have little or no involvement in school activities, work meets this set of needs. Even for students who make good grades, who participate in extracurricular activities, and who are college bound, work provides the only opportunity for them to win adult approval as represented by monetary compensation, the form of recognition most highly valued by our culture.

If students do not work, how do they spend their time and what are the relative advantages and disadvantages of these other activities as compared to work? It cannot be assumed that young people who are not working are engaged in more useful activities, or that these activities will have a more positive effect on their grades or post-high school education or income. While it is plausible that working -- or watching television or athletic training or preparing for the school play -- for more than twenty hours a week may have certain negative impacts on academic achievement, a young person's involvement in any activity and the time devoted to it must be judged on the basis of the cost-benefits of that activity compared to any activity someone believes is more beneficial for the student.

Students, like most of us, allocate their time to activities that meet their needs at a particular period in their lives. Because, for many students, work meets needs which are not satisfied elsewhere, they may devote a disproportionate amount of time to this activity. The real issue is whether for certain groups of youth there are beneficial alternatives to work, or whether such alternatives could be developed, and would they be equally or more successful in reconciling the needs of youth and society?

An interesting line of research, then, consistent with the psycho-social and ecological research suggested by Charner-Fraser, would determine whether students are motivated to work, at least in part, because they receive benefits from the workplace which they do not receive from their families, schools, or communities. If this is the case, which workplace benefits most highly valued

by the students are least frequently derived from other groups and institutions of which the students are a part? Are there ways in which these groups and institutions can be restructured or reformed in order to provide these benefits? Is it appropriate or necessary to do so? It would also be useful to identify high schools with similar SES characteristics which have very different proportions of their students enrolling, working, and to determine why this is the case and what effects it has on the students and their schools.

Though minority and at-risk youth were not the focus of the Charner-Fraser paper, the work-related problems of these youth demand the attention of the Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship. The Charner-Fraser paper reveals some disturbing, though not surprising, information about the group of students who benefit least from working:

- o "Race is a factor in explaining student participation in work activities....Black students consistently have lower participation rates."
- o "White students were most likely than their black peers to be employed at least half the school year."
- o "Minority students work fewer hours per week than white students."
- o "Clearly, the pay advantages accrued to males over females and whites over blacks....minority students tended to have lower wages than whites in almost every study."
- o "Except for minority males".... "less intensive work involvement (1-20 hours per week) of those in grade 11....actually appeared to lead to increased rates of high school completion."
- o "Blacks were most likely than others to hold odd jobs."
- o "Different jobs offer different opportunities for learning, initiative, autonomy, and social interaction."
- o "Work during school in such jobs as skilled trades, health fields, and factories serves as an entry mechanism into the adult labor market, particularly for those students who do not continue their schooling beyond high school."

Taken together, these findings tell us that the work experiences of minority youth tend to mirror those of their adult counterparts. Black youth work less,

earn less, have fewer opportunities to work in jobs with social-psychological benefits, and are less likely to work in jobs that help them enter the adult labor market.

Given that these findings are derived from information about the early, or even the first work experiences of black youth, the implications for our society are profound. More than two decades after the civil rights revolution many minority youth learn from their initial work experiences that even at the beginning of their work lives it is non-minority youth who can expect to benefit most from working. For many of them that experience confirms what they have heard from their friends, parents, and grandparents: discrimination in the work place is "alive and well" and hard work does not necessarily result in proportionate rewards. This may lead to cynicism and reduced efforts which can result in attitudes that limit chances for success, and that also reduce productivity.

There are other implications as well. Among black youth who graduate from high school, the proportion who subsequently pursue a post-secondary education is declining, at least in part due to reductions to Federal financial aid. If there are fewer jobs for black youth, and if they are earning considerably less than non-minority youth, it is more difficult for these young people to earn and save money to help finance their post-secondary educations. This underscores not only the need for additional financial aid but also for allocations of aid to take into account inequities in benefits available to the in-school youth labor force.

It would be useful to know how and to what extent these experiences shape minority youths' psycho-social development, their expectations about the future, their preparation for the future, and their productivity as adult workers. If the process of seeking work, and the results of working, are found to be negative experiences for certain groups of black youth, what corrective policies are

necessary? What must be done so that the work experiences of minority youth promote, rather than retard, the development of attitudes and behaviors valued by employers and society? Are there other activities that yield benefits similar to work which in-school minority youth should be encouraged to pursue instead of work? In these post-YEDPA years more information is also needed about whether, how, and with what effect the private sector, and each level of government, is initiating policies and programs that provide more frequent, equitable, and beneficial early work experiences for in-school minority youth.

The Charner-Fraser paper poses some interesting possibilities for more closely linking students' work and school experiences. Unfortunately, educators who already feel overburdened by state education reforms, limited funding, and mandates from all levels of government will probably view these as one more special interest "wish list." There is, indeed, exciting potential for drawing upon students' work experience to make high school curricula more relevant, but this will require teachers and principals interested in identifying and exploiting opportunities to open up the learning process. While initiatives to encourage schools to help students benefit more from their part-time work experiences are appropriate, it is not clear how many schools will respond positively. Devoting time and energy to issues related to students' work is simply not a priority among educators, and considering the challenges to the basic mission of the public schools, it is not likely to become a priority in the near future.

One promising means to encourage public schools' attention to students' work is through present concerns about at-risk youth and dropouts. Schools are coming under increasing pressure to increase the number of students graduating from high school by devoting more attention to at-risk students and by employing a variety of dropout prevention strategies. Within this context it would make sense for schools to: (1) closely monitor the impact of students' work on their

school performance, and provide counseling as appropriate; (2) adapt the student's curricula so that basic skills instruction is related to an employer's assessment of a student's demonstrated deficiencies in the student's workplace, and encourage the employer to provide feedback and support; (3) work with the private sector to provide part-time employment as an incentive for improved academic performance by low achieving students, and incorporate job search and pre-employment skill training into the core curricula of these students; and (4) assure that every at-risk student receives the support necessary to develop and state a realistic short-term occupational or educational goal for which high school is a time of preparation, and facilitate the student's participation in curricula and part-time work that the student agrees will help to achieve the indicated goal.

While different in-school youth react differently to part-time work, it remains a necessary and useful first step in the transition to the adult workplace. It enables students to test themselves and to develop skills and self-confidence. They learn they can accomplish, and survive, tasks they otherwise would not have chosen and thought they could not carry out. Work is not the only crucible in which this form of self-discovery can take place, but for most young people it provides lessons and leads to personal growth in ways that are not provided by other institutions in our society. There is a continuing obligation by adults to both ensure that there are more opportunities for youth to experience these rewards outside the workplace, and to ensure that the workplace itself is making these benefits equally available to young people from all groups in our society.

HAYES MIZELL was the South Carolina Coordinator of the State Employment Initiatives for Youth Demonstration Project. For the past twenty years he has been involved as a lay citizen in a wide variety of activities to improve public education. He has been active at the local, state, and national levels as an advocate for school desegregation, student rights, educational programs for disadvantaged students, and increased citizen involvement in the governance of public education. He was also instrumental in building the base of support that led to the enactment of South Carolina's Education Finance Act.

Mr. Mizell has twice served as an elected member of the Columbia, S.C. school board and is Vice-Chairman of the South Carolina Basic Skills Advisory Commission. In 1983, he was appointed by the Governor to one of two blue ribbon panels established to develop recommendations that became the basis for South Carolina's historic Education Improvement Act. He was subsequently appointed to the Joint Subcommittee which monitors the implementation of the Act. He also serves as a member of the State Department of Education's Private Sector Committee on Education.

At the national level, Mizell is a member of the Board of Directors of the National Committee for Citizens in Education. In 1979, he was appointed by President Carter as Chairman of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children and served in that capacity until 1982. He was also a founder of the National Coalition of Advocates for Students.

Mr. Mizell recently took up new duties in New York City as Director, Program for Disadvantaged Youth at the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation.

PUBLICATIONS OF YOUTH AND AMERICA'S FUTURE THE WILLIAM T. GRANT FOUNDATION COMMISSION ON WORK, FAMILY AND CITIZENSHIP

Publications of the Commission are *not copyrighted* and their distribution is *encouraged*. When quoting or reproducing Commission publications, please note the source as: "Youth and America's Future: The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship."

American Youth: A Statistical Snapshot (July 1987) by James Wetzel

Drawing on the latest, statistically reliable government surveys, this demographic review captures much of the diversity inherent in a collective portrait of American 15-24 year-olds. Includes data on marriage, childbearing, living arrangements, income, education, employment, health, and juvenile justice. Historical trends as well as future projections are presented along with *12 charts, 18 tables*.

Current Federal Policies and Programs for Youth (June 1987) by J.R. Reingold and Associates

Who is doing what for youth in the federal government? This concise survey of current federal policies and programs for youth in Education, Health and Human Services, Labor, Justice and Defense provides a one-of-a-kind resource for researchers, practitioners, analysts and policymakers who want quick access to accurate information about federal youth policy. *Includes state-level allocation tables.*

Youth Policies and Programs in Selected Countries (August 1987) by Rosemary George

Presents the salient features of the post-compulsory education and training policies of 11 foreign countries designed to smooth the transition of non-college-bound youth into the work place. The countries are: Australia, Britain, Canada, Finland, France, West Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Norway and Sweden. *Includes tables.*

Single copies of these three publications will be available for a *limited time* and without charge from: **William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Youth and America's Future**, Suite 301, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036-5541

Multiple copies may be purchased at **\$5.00 each** from either organization:

Institute for Educational Leadership
Suite 310, 1001 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20036-5541

or

National School Volunteer Program
Suite 320, 701 North Fairfax Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

*

*

*

The following **Working Papers** were prepared for the Commission's deliberations by a variety of scholars and practitioners. They are available at **\$10.00 each postpaid** from the **Institute for Educational Leadership** (address above).

Youth Transition from Adolescence to the World of Work by Garth Mangum. **Commentaries** by Marvin Lazerson and Stephen Hamilton.

Youth and the Workplace: Second-chance Programs and the Hard-to-Serve by Thomas J. Smith, Gary C. Walker, Rachel A. Baker (Public/Private Ventures). **Commentaries** by Gary Burtless, Jacqueline Danzberger, Morton Sklar, Richard F. Elmore.

Who Will Train and Educate Tomorrow's Workers? The Financing of Non-College-Bound Young Workers by Robert Sheets, Andrew Hahn, Robert Lerman and Eric Butler. **Commentaries** by Peter L. Szanton, Paul V. Delker and Warren Ziegler.

Youth and Work: What We Know; What We Don't Know; What We Need to Know by Ivan Charner and Bryna Shore Fraser (National Institute for Work and Learning). **Commentaries** by Sue E. Berryman and Hayes Mizell.

The Bridge: Cooperative Education by Cynthia Parsons. **Commentaries** by Dennis Gray and David Lynn, Morgan V. Lewis, Roy L. Wooldridge.